AN

ELEMENTARY COURSE

OF

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY,

TRANSLATED FROM THE WORK OF

PROFESSORS STORR AND FLATT,

WITH

ADDITIONS

BY S. S. SCHMUCKER, A. M.

Professor of Theology in the Theol. Sem. of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, Gettysburg, Pa.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

ANDOVER:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY FLAGG & GOULD,

AT THE CODMAN PRESS.

1826.

Q85
S88ES
v.1

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, to wit:

District Clerk's Office.

Be it remembered, that on the twenty fifth day of April, A. D. 1826, and in the fiftieth year of the Independence of the United States of America, Flagg & Gould, of the said district, have deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof they claim as proprietors, in the words following, *to wit*:—"An Elementary Course of Biblical Theology, translated from the work of Professors Storr and Flatt, with Additions by S. S. Schmucker, A. M., Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, Gettysburg, Penn. In two volumes." In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned:" and also to an act entitled, "An Act supplementary to an act, entitled, An act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints."

JOHN W. DAVIS, *Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.*

TO THE

REVEREND CLERGY

OF THE

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH

IN THE

UNITED STATES,

THIS ATTEMPT

TO PROMOTE THE CAUSE OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH

AND

THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE

is most respectfully inscribed by

THE TRANSLATOR.

17022

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE work which is here presented to the public, is the result of the joint labour of two of the most eminent divines of the present age. Theophilus Christian Storr,[1] formerly Theological Professor in the University of Tübingen, was a very distinguished interpreter of the Holy Volume, and one of the most triumphant combatants of that fashionable philosophy with which Europe has been deluged. His numerous philological and exegetical works rank among the first critical productions of Germany, and few men have attained such profundity of erudition, and at the same time preserved so humble and faithful an adherence to the doctrines of the Bible, as are displayed in the literary and theological career of Dr. Storr. In his earlier life, after he had acquired a profound and critical knowledge of the original languages of Scripture and the cognate dialects, *he confined himself for some time to the study of the Holy Volume to the exclusion of all other theological works.* Accordingly his various productions display an extraordinary familiarity with the Bible, and in reference especially to Biblical learning, might with truth be applied to him what Casaubon said of his friend the great Salmasius, that he was "*ad miraculum doctus.*" Nor is, in general, his colleague and com-

---

1 Dr. Storr was born at Stuttgard, Sept. 18, 1746. Died Jan. 17, 1805.

mentator Dr. C. C. Flatt at all his inferior. These distinguished champions of the truth sustained the cause of orthodoxy for upward of twenty years, and published from time to time, the most able replies to the several systems of infidelity which sprung up in Europe. Having been harassed by metaphysical and speculative and infidel systems of pretended Christianity, they were taught the absolute necessity of building their faith exclusively on the word of God; and the present work is purely of this Biblical character. It is confined to the doctrines which are taught in the sacred volume TOTIDEM VERBIS. The various INFERENTIAL, sectarian views, which are used by divines of different denominations to complete their peculiar systems, are here omitted; even those of the Lutheran church to which the authors belonged. The work is composed with the highest regard to exegesis, composed too in view of all the objections which the liberalists of the last thirty years have been able to raise. That such a work is peculiarly needed in the present day, must be evident to every reflecting mind acquainted with the course of theological discussion in our country. In regard to the dress in which the work is presented to the English public, it was the translator's wish that it might appear in the most favourable aspect. This he endeavoured to effect on the one hand by avoiding that servility, which whilst it hampered his diction would render the work offensive to the classic mind; and on the other, by guarding against that liberty which degenerates into unwarranted license, and deserves the name, not of translation but paraphrase. In the management of the work, some important improvements have been attempted. The original is printed thus: first, the propositions or text; next,

notes; thirdly, notes upon these notes, by Storr; then notes upon all these notes, by Flatt; which occasionally creates much perplexity and confusion to the reader. All these the translator has incorporated into one continuous and connected discussion, consisting simply of the text or propositions and the Illustrations or discussion of them. The extremely numerous references which abound in all Storr's works, are generally thrown into the margin. Numerous additions also have been made to the body of the work. The most important of these are the translation of the very frequent quotations from heathen authors, from the earlier ecclesiastical writers, and from the Old and New Testament. In some instances the critical reader will perceive, that improved translations have been given to Scripture texts. On these the translator spent much time and investigation, and it is hoped his decisions will be found to have been made not without judgment. Every thing, also, included in [ ], throughout the work, is added by the translator. In a few instances in which the learned author's enthymemes seemed somewhat obscure, his reasoning has perhaps been rendered more lucid by the insertion of the intermediate link in his chain of reasoning. For the purpose of facilitating references, a caption or summary view of contents, has been prefixed to every Illustration in the work, excepting those only which were so brief as not to require it. The occasional original additions are distinguished by the letter S. To the article of the Trinity an appendix has been added, in which an attempt is made to prove that this doctrine, as now understood and defended, is perfectly accordant with reason, and cannot be assailed on any ground of true philosophy.

mentator Dr. C. C. Flatt at all his inferior. These distinguished champions of the truth sustained the cause of orthodoxy for upward of twenty years, and published from time to time, the most able replies to the several systems of infidelity which sprung up in Europe. Having been harassed by metaphysical and speculative and infidel systems of pretended Christianity, they were taught the absolute necessity of building their faith exclusively on the word of God; and the present work is purely of this Biblical character. It is confined to the doctrines which are taught in the sacred volume TOTIDEM VERBIS. The various INFERENTIAL, sectarian views, which are used by divines of different denominations to complete their peculiar systems, are here omitted; even those of the Lutheran church to which the authors belonged. The work is composed with the highest regard to exegesis, composed too in view of all the objections which the liberalists of the last thirty years have been able to raise. That such a work is peculiarly needed in the present day, must be evident to every reflecting mind acquainted with the course of theological discussion in our country. In regard to the dress in which the work is presented to the English public, it was the translator's wish that it might appear in the most favourable aspect. This he endeavoured to effect on the one hand by avoiding that servility, which whilst it hampered his diction would render the work offensive to the classic mind; and on the other, by guarding against that liberty which degenerates into unwarranted license, and deserves the name, not of translation but paraphrase. In the management of the work, some important improvements have been attempted. The original is printed thus: first, the propositions or text; next,

notes; thirdly, notes upon these notes, by Storr; then notes upon all these notes, by Flatt; which occasionally creates much perplexity and confusion to the reader. All these the translator has incorporated into one continuous and connected discussion, consisting simply of the text or propositions and the Illustrations or discussion of them. The extremely numerous references which abound in all Storr's works, are generally thrown into the margin. Numerous additions also have been made to the body of the work. The most important of these are the translation of the very frequent quotations from heathen authors, from the earlier ecclesiastical writers, and from the Old and New Testament. In some instances the critical reader will perceive, that improved translations have been given to Scripture texts. On these the translator spent much time and investigation, and it is hoped his decisions will be found to have been made not without judgment. Every thing, also, included in [ ], throughout the work, is added by the translator. In a few instances in which the learned author's enthymemes seemed somewhat obscure, his reasoning has perhaps been rendered more lucid by the insertion of the intermediate link in his chain of reasoning. For the purpose of facilitating references, a caption or summary view of contents, has been prefixed to every Illustration in the work, excepting those only which were so brief as not to require it. The occasional original additions are distinguished by the letter S. To the article of the Trinity an appendix has been added, in which an attempt is made to prove that this doctrine, as now understood and defended, is perfectly accordant with reason, and cannot be assailed on any ground of true philosophy.

The translator deems it no less an act of justice than a source of gratification, to acknowledge his obligation in the publication of this work to Professors Stuart and Murdock, as well for the encouragement given him to proceed with the translation, as for the aid afforded in conducting it through the press.

Having consented to add this laborious task to his numerous other duties, at the request of some of his clerical brethren whose wishes he could not disregard; and having conducted the work, as he humbly trusts, with a supreme reference to the glory of the divine Redeemer, he cannot but pray, most earnestly, that in his benevolent Providence, it may be made instrumental in the promotion of the interests of his kingdom. To God, therefore, and to the blessing of his gracious Providence, he would commend these first fruits of that life which he has received from his hand, which like a vapour is passing away, and which he prays may ever be devoted to him who gave it.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

OF THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Page

A. *The New Testament.*

PART I. Of the genuineness of the N. Test. §§ 1—3.

1. Testimony of heathen writers respecting the early existence of the writings of the Christians, § 1 . 13
2. Genuineness of the homologoumena, § 2 22
3. Genuineness of the antilegomena, § 3 89

PART II. Integrity of the books of the N. T. § 4 128

PART. III. Credibility of the N. T.

1. Historical, § 5 135
2. Doctrinal.—Divinity of the N. T. § 6—12.

a) Jesus himself maintained the divinity of his mission and doctrines, § 6 149

The truth of this declaration of Jesus, is established

α. From his general character and conduct.—The plan of Jesus, § 7 154

β. From his miracles, § 8 160

His miracles were not allegorical narratives, Illust. 2 163

—They were not the effects of human agency, nor a work of deception, Illust. 3 173

—Not the result of an accidental coincidence of circumstances, Illust. 4 175

—But are actually proofs of his divine mission, Illust. 5, 6 . . . . . 179, 181

b) Jesus assures us, that *the doctrines of the apostles* also, possess divine authority, § 9 186

Paul possessed divine authority: This is evinced by his own declaration in connexion with the history of his vocation to the apostleship, and his miracles, and the testimony of the other apostles in his favour, § 10 199

c) The *writings of the apostles*, also possess divine authority, § 11 212

d) The *writings of the evangelists* Mark and Luke, also possess divine authority, § 12 219

B. *Divine authority of the Old Testament.*

1. The divinity of the Old Testament is founded on the declarations of Jesus and his apostles, § 13 226

2. The O. T. contained the same books, at the time of Jesus and his apostles, which it contains now; as may be proved from the N. Test. from Josephus, and from Philo, § 14 251

Inference: The Holy Scriptures are the standard of our faith, § 15 269

Confirmation of the divinity of the Scriptures from internal personal experience: inward witness of the Holy Spirit, § 16 276

BOOK II.

OF GOD.

PART I. Of our idea of God; and its truth.

I. Sources of evidence for the divine existence.

1. Even conscience points us to a God, § 17 . . . 285

2. The moral nature of man, connected with the constitution of nature, necessarily leads him to the belief of a Moral Author and Governor of the world.—Combination of Physico-theology with moral theology, § 18 291

3. Our belief in the existence of God is confirmed by the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, § 19 . . 309

II. Biblical idea of God—he is Creator and Governor of the world, § 20 315
III. Attributes of God.
1. Power, § 21 316
2. Knowledge and wisdom, § 22 318
3. The goodness of God, and its compatibility with the existence of physical evil, § 23 325
4. Justice and holiness, § 24 328
5. Spirituality, § 25 335
6. Veracity, § 26 336
The truth of the Scriptures is a necessary consequence of the veracity of God, § 27 340
7. Unity of God—it cannot indeed be conclusively proved from reason, but from Scripture it can, § 28 342
8. Eternity and immutability of God: inferred from his absolutely necessary existence, § 29 347
9. Incomparability of God, § 30 349

PART II. Creation and Providence.
I. *Creation.*
1. Immediate creation.—a) Immediate creation out of nothing.—b) Immediate formation of the earth out of the materials already created, § 31 . . 355
2. Mediate creation, § 32 361
II. *Preservation* of the universe, § 33 364
III. *Government* of the world.—Providence.
1. Idea of the divine government — *particular* providence, § 34 366
2. Government of the world by the immediate agency of God.
a) The possibility of it, § 35 368
b) The reality of it—proved from the miracles, § 36 372
Difference between miracles and other instances of the supernatural agency of God, § 37 . . 381

c) Necessity of admitting the possibility of the supernatural agency of God in the world, in reference to prayer, § 38 383
3. Divine government in the course of nature—Permission of moral evil, § 39 389
The doctrine of divine Providence affords no justification for indolence or temerity, § 40 . . 394
Conclusion of this chapter, § 41 395

PART III. Doctrine of the Trinity.
I. *The divinity of Christ.*
1. Its proof, § 42 397
2. Importance of this doctrine.—Baptism in the name of Christ as the Son of God, § 43 445
3. Personal difference between the Father and the Son, § 44 452
II. *Divinity of the Holy Spirit*, and his personal difference from the Father and the Son, § 45 . . 457
III. The difference between *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*—the nature of this distinction is inexplicable, § 46 460

Appendix by the Translator.
On the relation of the doctrine of the Trinity to reason 467

BOOK I.

OF THE DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

PART I.

OF THE GENUINENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 1. *Testimony of heathen writers respecting the extension of Christianity and the early existence of the religious writings of the Christians.*

It is evident from the testimony even of authors who were not Christians, that during the reign of Nero and the period immediately subsequent, the Christians were not only augmenting their numbers in Judea, where Christianity had originated; but were also extending their influence into other countries(1); and used certain sacred writings(2), which were in part peculiar to themselves, and different(3) from the more ancient religious books of the Jews.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Evidence of the early existence and multiplication of the Christians.

Tacitus,[1] in his narrative of the extensive conflagration, with which Rome was visited during the reign of Nero, makes use

[1 Caius Cornelius Tacitus, the intimate friend of Pliny the younger, was born A. D. 61 or 62. He was appointed to some of the highest offices of honour and confidence under the emperor Vespasian and his successors,

of the following language;—"Nero," in order to avert the suspicion that the city had been set on fire by his private command, "inflicted the most studied tortures upon a class of persons, odious for their vices, and known among the populace by the name of Christians. This name was derived from Christ, who was executed by Pontius Pilate the procurator, during the reign of Tiberius. But this pernicious superstition, which was suppressed at the time, again burst forth and pervaded not only Judea, where the evil had commenced, but also the city itself, the place in which every thing that is shameful concentrates, and every thing atrocious is practised."[1]

The testimony of Suetonius[2] is very brief, and couched in the following words;—"Punishments were inflicted on the

and was contemporaneous with some of the apostles. In addition to this testimony, Tacitus, in his account of the incidents of the year of our Lord 57, states, that Pomponia Græcina, a lady of eminent rank, was accused of what he terms a foreign superstition (*superstitionis externæ*), which, as Lipsius (ad locum) observes, was very probably the Christian religion. S.]

1. "Quæsitissimis poenis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos, vulgus *Christianos* appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, qui Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt, celebranturque." Annales, Lib. XV. c. 44.

[2 Caius Suetonius Tranquillus, a Roman biographer and historian, flourished in the reigns of Trajan and Adrian. He was most probably born about the beginning of the reign of Vespasian A. D. 70. This writer also states that between the years A. D. 41 and 54, Claudius the emperor, "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit," i. e. he banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, Chrestus being their leader,—that is, as Grotius states, on account of the doctrines of Christ. For both Tertullian (Ap. c. 3.) and Lactantius (Div. Inst. L. 4. c. 7.) state that the heathen pronounced the Saviour's name *Chrestus;* and Dr Lardner (Works vol. 7. p. 266) remarks "it is not impossible that the Jewish enmity against those of their own country or others who had embraced Christianity, might produce some disputes and disturbances which came to the emperor's ear." Yet it must be confessed that Orosius, of the fifth century, was in doubt as to the meaning of this passage. S.]

Christians, a race of men addicted to a new and mischievous (*magical* [1]) superstition."[2]

And Pliny,[3] in his well known epistle, makes the following

[1 To this version of the word *maleficæ*, the translator is aware that some objection can be made. Its more commonly received signification is *pernicious, mischievous;* and thus it has been rendered in the passage before us by the learned and excellent Lutheran divine, Dr Mosheim. According to either version, the passage proves indisputably the fact in support of which it is adduced. The version adopted has however these advantages; it not only proves that Suetonius was acquainted with the new sect called Christians, but it farther evinces the falsity of the insinuation which the unbelieving Gibbon advanced to invalidate the evidences of Christianity, viz. that the great historians of the day have taken no notice of the pretended miracles of the first Christians, &c. For this passage of Suetonius proves that he had heard of those miracles, although having for obvious reasons not examined the evidence of their truth, he ascribed them to a magical superstition. This translation is adopted by Dr Watson, Lardner, and many other men, and in support of his opinion the learned Bishop of Landaff says—"The Theodosian Code must be my excuse for dissenting from such respectable authority; in IX Cod. Theod. Tit. XVI. we read; 'Chaldæi, ac *Magi*, et ceteros quos vulgus *maleficos* ob facinorum multitudinem appellat—Si quis *magus* vel magicis contaminibus adsuetus qui *maleficus* vulgi consuetudine nuncupatur.' Nor ought any friend of Christianity to be astonished or alarmed at Suetonius' applying the word *magical* to the Christian religion; for the miracles wrought by Christ and his apostles, principally consisted in alleviating the distresses, by curing the obstinate diseases, of human kind; and the proper meaning of magic as understood by the ancients is a higher and more holy branch of the art of healing." Dr Flatt also in his Annotationes ad Philosophiam Kantii &c. says, that this testimony of Suetonius undoubtedly does authorize the inference, that the miracles of Jesus and his apostles must have been historically true. S.]

2 "Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ." Nero, c. 16.

[3 Caius Plinius Cæcilius Secundus was born A. D. 61 or 62. He enjoyed the particular friendship of Trajan, who made him consul. His celebrated letter, from which the extract in the text is taken, was written A. D. 107. It is the testimony of one of the most enlightened men of that age, which establishes the important facts, that the ground of the persecution against the Christians in Pontus and Bithynia was, that they drew men away from the worship of their deities; that in less than seventy years after the disciples first preached Jesus to the gentiles, Christians abounded in Pontus and Bithynia to such a degree, that the heathen temples were visibly neglected, and their remaining friends began to fear "whereunto this thing would grow;" that they were generally remarkably constant in their profession; and many other facts of the deepest interest to the Christian heart. S.]

remarks, which prove the extensive diffusion of Christianity ;—"Many of every age, and every rank, and even of both sexes, have been accused, and will be accused. Nor has this contagious superstition pervaded only the cities, but it has also spread through the towns and country."[1]

The reader may consult Haversaat's Vindication of Pliny's Epistles concerning the Christians, against the objections urged by Semler.

[The testimony of Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, from the universally acknowledged veracity of his character and the fact that he was contemporaneous with the apostles, is of the utmost importance. As the biblical student in America can rarely have access to the original work of Josephus, we will insert the celebrated passage entire, and add to it a translation.

Γινεται δε κατα τουτον τον χρονον Ιησους τις, σοφος ανηρ, ειγε ανδρα αυτον λεγειν χρη. Ην γαρ παραδοξων εργων ποιητης, διδασκαλος ανθρωπων των συν ηδονη ταληθη δεχομενων. Και πολλους μεν Ιουδαιους, πολλους δε και Ἑλληνικους επηγαγετο. Ὁ Χριστος ουτος ην. Και αυτον ενδειξει των πρωτων ανδρων παρ' ημιν σταυρῳ επιτετιμηκοτος Πιλατου, ουκ επαυσαντο οιγε αυτον αγαπησαντες. Εφανη γαρ αυτοις τριτην εχων ημεραν παλιν ζων, των θειων προφητων ταυτα τε και αλλα μυρια θαυμασια περι αυτου ειρηκοτων. Εις ετι τε νυν των Χριστιανων, απο τουδε ωνομασμενων, ουκ επελιπε το φυλον. Lib. XVIII. Antiq. Judaic. cap. III. 3.

"Now there lived about this time, a certain Jesus, a wise man, if indeed it is proper to call him a man. For he performed many wonderful works : he was an instructor of those persons who received the truth with willingness. *He induced many to become his followers, as well among the Jews as also among the*

1 "Multi omnis ætatis, omnis ordinis, utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque enim civitates tantum, sed vicos etiam, atque agros, superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est," Lib. X. ep. 97.

Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when on the accusation of our principal men, Pilate condemned him to the cross, these did not cease to love him. For he appeared to them again, alive, on the third day; the divine prophets having foretold these and a myriad of other wonderful things concerning him. And even at the present time the tribe of Christians, so denominated from him, still subsists."[1] S.]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Evidence that the Christians had sacred writings.

Michaelis, in his Introduction to the New Testament,[2] quotes from Lucian's work De Morte Peregrini,[3] the words which refer to this subject;—*των βιβλων τας μεν εξηγειτο και διεσαφει Περιγρινος*, i. e. Peregrinus explained and illustrated some of their books; and he is of opinion that the writings here alluded to, may have been the books of the Old Testament and the Hebrew gospel of Matthew; because this passage of Lucian refers to Nazarene Christians, who were resident in Palestine.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Evidence that the sacred writings of the Christians were in part different from the more ancient books of the Jews.

Celsus, a writer of the second century, in his work against the Christians, not only assails Moses and the prophets, whom he knew the Gnostic sect of Christians rejected; but he also introduces a Jew as disputing with the Christians out of their own books, and makes the Jew conclude his disputation with the following words;—*ταυτα μεν ουν ὑμιν εκ των ὑμετερων συγγραμματων, εφ' οἷς ουδενος αλλου μαρτυρος χρησομεν· αυτοι γαρ ἑαυτους περιπιπτετε*[4] i. e. all these objections are derived from your

[1 The authenticity of this passage is ably vindicated by *C. G. Bretschneider*, Parerg. ad Capita Theol. Judæorum dogmaticæ e Fl. Josephi scriptis collecta;—translated and printed in the Christian Spectator for March 1825. S.]

2 Third edit. p. 40. 4th edit. p. 41. 3 c. 11.

4 Origines contra Celsum, Lib. II. § 74.

own writings, besides which we need no additional evidence, for you confute yourselves.

From the quotations made by Origen from Celsus, it is apparent that the Christian writings, to which Celsus alluded in the passage above quoted, *contained a biography of Jesus:* for the Jew whom he introduces is represented[1] as addressing Jesus himself, and urging the following accusations: "that his pretensions to being born of a virgin were false; that he was born in Judea of an indigent female, who was the wife of a carpenter, and had been convicted of adultery and discarded by her husband, and who gave birth to Jesus as she was wandering about; that poverty compelled him to seek employment in Egypt, where he became skilled in Egyptian necromancy (*δυναμεις*); and that being inflated with his magical attainments, on his return to his native land, he called himself God."

It is further evident from the objections advanced by Celsus, that our four Gospels formed a part of the sacred books used by the Christians when he wrote against them: for some of those objections have a reference individually to each of the evangelists, and others are derived from a comparison of the four.

Thus Origen says, "And after these things he recurs to what followed the birth of Jesus—to the narrative of the star and of the Magians who came from the east."[2] And it is well known, that the account of the star and of the Magians from the east is found only in Matthew. In other passages of the work just cited,[3] Christ is himself termed *τεκτων* i. e. carpenter, an appellation given him only in the gospel of Mark 6: 3 *ουκ ὑτος εστιν ὁ τεκτων*; i.e. is not this the carpenter, &c. Again he remarks

---

[1] Origen. loc. cit. Lib. I. § 28.

[2] *Και μετα ταυτα ανατρεχει επι το ἑξης τῃ γενεσει του Ιησου αναγεγραμμενον—το περι του αστερος διηγημα και των εληλυθοτων απο ανατολης μαγων.* Lib. I. contra Celsum § 40. Compare Süskind Symbol. ad illustranda quædam evangeliorum loca. 1802. Pt. I. p. 3—9.

[3] Lib. VI. §§ 34, 36, 37.

—"Celsus says that those display a great deal of presumption who trace the lineage of Christ from the first progenitor of the human family, and from the Jewish kings;"[1]—and this is done no where but in the genealogy of Luke 3:38. Again, the same writer says,[2] "Celsus reproaches the Christians for pretending that the Son of God is the *λογος* or word (*αυτολογος*), which is an evident reference to John 1:1. A case of an objection derived from a comparison of the four evangelists, is that in which he accuses the historians of Christ of contradicting one another, *εναντια σφισι ψευδεσθαι*, and he adduces, as an example, the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ, some mentioning *one* and the others *two* angels as having come to the grave and spoken to the women.[3] This is a reference to Matt. 28:5. Mark 16:5. Luke 24:4. John 20:12.[4]

But Celsus' knowledge was not confined to the gospels; it is evident that he was likewise acquainted with the other writings (*συγγραμματα*) of the Christians. This is evinced by a passage[5] of that writer, in which he is assailing the words of the Saviour: "there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall perform great signs and miracles."[6] He there endeavours to prove from them that the miracles of Christ are not divine, and adds: *και Σαταναν τινα τοιαυτα παραμηχανωμενον ονομαζει* i. e. Jesus mentions a certain Satan who should also perform such miracles. Now neither in the above passage relative to the "false Christs," nor in any other, is there any such asser-

---

[1] *Φησι* (sc. *Κελσος*) *απηυθαδησθαι τους γενεαλογησαντας απο του πρωτου φυντος και των εν Ιουδαιοις βασιλεων τον Ιησουν.* Lib. II. § 32.

[2] Lib. II. § 31.

[3] *Και μην προς τον αυτου τουδε ταφον ελθειν αγγελον, οἱ μεν ἑνα, οἱ δε δυο* (*λεγουσι*) *τους αποκρινομενους ταις γυναιξιν, ὁτι ανεστη.* Lib. V. § 52.

[4] See Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, pt. I. p. 38—40. Tübingen, 1808.

[5] § 49.

[6] Matt. 24:24.

tion contained as Celsus attributes to Christ. But in Rev. 12: 13, the power of working delusive miracles is ascribed to Satan, *ὁ δρακων*. And as this book professes to be "the Revelation of Jesus Christ,"[1] Celsus may have alluded to this text, and therefore have ascribed it to Jesus. But as Celsus frequently attributed to Christ whatever he found in the writings of his disciples;[2] it is more probable that he alluded to the passage of the apostle Paul, 2 Thess. 2: 9. And this is the more plausible, as he in another place, whilst speaking of the power of Satan to perform delusive miracles, quotes the passage above referred to relative to Satan, and in connexion with it uses the following words which very much resemble the context of 2 Thess 2: 9.—"The Son of God apprised his followers that Satan would make his appearance in a manner similar to his own 'coming,' that he would arrogate to himself the glory of God, and display great and marvellous works, to which however they should pay no attention, but determinately rejecting them should believe in him (Jesus) only."[3] Comp. 2 Thess. 2: 4, 11, 12, 13.

Other traces of allusions to several epistles of Paul in the writings of Celsus, are pointed out by Hug in his Introduction to the New Testament."[4]

Thus also, in the third century, Porphyry in his attack on the Christians, not only assails the sacred books of the Jews, especially the book of Daniel, of which he used the Greek translation then received among the Christians; but he professedly directs his principal energies against the peculiar scrip-

---

1 Rev. 1: 1. 22: 16.

2 Thus, for instance, he attributed to Christ what the evangelists had related, that, at his baptism, something descended from the air like a bird, and rested upon him. Origen, L. I. § 41.

3 *Ὁ του θεου παις παραγορευει ὡς αρα ὁ Σατανας και αυτος ὁμοιως φανεις, επιδειξεται μεγαλα εργα και θαυμαστα, σφετεριζομενος την του θεου δοξαν, οἷς ου χρηναι προσεχειν βουληθεντας αποτρεπεσθαι εκεινον, αλλα μονῳ πιστευειν ἑαυτῳ.*

4 Part I. p. 41.

tures of the Christians. And as far as can be inferred from the few passages incidentally quoted from him by Jerome, he was acquainted at least with the gospels of Matthew, Mark and John. For Jerome mentions[1] an error of which Porphyry accuses the evangelists in their account of Jesus' walking on the sea, an incident recorded in Matt. 14: 25, &c. Mark 6: 48, &c. and John 6: 19. He also states[2] that Porphyry assails the account of Matthew's vocation, which is found only in the gospel of this evangelist; that he objects to Mark 1: 2; and takes occasion from John 7: 8, 10, to accuse Jesus of instability of character.[3] Perhaps he was also acquainted with the Acts of the apostles,[4] or at least with the epistle to the Galatians; for Jerome[5] mentions an unfair use which he made of the dispute between Paul and Peter. And even Chrysostom[6] appeals to Celsus and Porphyry for the antiquity of the New Testament Scriptures. He remarks: *ικανοι δε και καθ' ημων ειρηκοτες, την αρχαιοτητα μαρτυρησαι των βιβλιων, οι περι Κελσον και τον Βατανεωτην τον μετ' εκεινον. Ου γαρ δη τοις μετ' αυτους συντεθεισιν αντελεγον*, i. e. those who were our enemies, Celsus and after him Bataneotes,[7] are suitable witnesses to testify the antiquity of our books:—for they did not surely endeavour to refute books which were composed after the time in which they lived.

To the testimony of Porphyry and Celsus may be added that of Amelius, who, as we learn from Eusebius, was acquainted with the gospel of John.[8]

---

1 Quæst. in Genes. cap. 1. v. 10.

2 Hieron. in Matt. 9: 9. 3: 3.

3 Hieron. contra Pelag. Lib. II. § 17.

4 Id. Com. in Joel 2: 28, &c.

5 Comment. in Es. 53: 12. Proem. in Ep. ad Gal.

6 Homil. VI. in Ep. 1 ad Corinth.

[7 Bataneotes was a name given to Porphyry by both Jerome and Chrysostom; but the reason of this apellation seems to be but imperfectly known. Heumann supposed it to be a fictitious name affixed by Porphyry himself to his work against the Christians; and Fabricius thinks it derived from Batanéa, a town in Syria, in which he supposes Porphyry may have been born. S.]

8 Præp. Evang. L. XI. c. 18, 19.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

There is nothing strange in the preceding heathen testimony in favour of the Christian Scriptures.

Nor is it by any means surprising that pagan writers should be acquainted with the facts, established by their testimony in the preceding illustrations, when we recollect what Tertullian says to them in his defence of the Christians against the heathen, c. 31: "Read" says he "the words of God, our Scriptures," from which he soon after quotes some words of Christ, and c. 32, of Paul, "which we ourselves have no disposition to conceal from your view, and which have, in various ways, fallen into the hands of those who are not Christians."

§ 2. *The genuineness of the homologoumena or universally received books of the New Testament.*

If we listen to the testimony of the Christians themselves, we find that not only the age of *Eusebius* (the commencement of the fourth century), and the earlier age in which *Origen* lived (the third century)(1), but also the tradition of still more ancient times(2), that is, the concurrent opinion of all those writers whose productions had fallen into the hands of these Christian Fathers(3), unanimously declare the *four Gospels*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, *thirteen epistles of Paul*, and the *first epistle of John and first of Peter*, to be the genuine productions(4) of those disciples of Jesus to whom they are ascribed. Nor have we any reason to doubt their genuineness. For in the few fragments of those earlier writers which have reached us, we find that they did actually view these books in that light, in which, Origen and Eu-

sebius, report these earlier writers to have viewed them(5). Moreover there is nothing found in these writings incongruous either with the age in which they are said to have been written, or the authors to whom they are attributed(6). And even those (heretics) to whose interest the authority of these sacred writings was extremely prejudicial, did not at first presume to dispute their genuineness; but endeavoured to extricate themselves from their difficulties by arbitrary interpretations(7) of the odious paragraphs, or by the alteration, or erasure of them; thereby pronouncing these writings not spurious but only adulterated (8); or finally, they sought refuge by denying the authority of the writers(9), while they confessed the genuineness of the books. And when, in the course of time, they began to dispute even the genuineness of the writings, they did not urge the want of ancient testimony in their favour, or attempt to impugn their genuineness with any historical objections; but they were contented to adduce some trifling pretended doctrinal objections, extorted from the writings which were the object of their hatred.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The testimony of the ages of Eusebius and Origen.[1]

The principal passages of Eusebius and Origen, containing their testimony on this subject, and which will frequently be referred to in the sequel, are the following.

[1 Eusebius, surnamed Pamphilus from his friend the martyr of that name, was born at Cesarea in Palestine about A. D. 270, or perhaps earlier. He flourished principally during the reigns of Constantius and Constantine; and as Jerome states "was a man most studious in the divine Scriptures, was very diligent in making a large collection of the writings of Christian authors, and published innumerable volumes." He was made bishop of Cæsarea about 315, and died in 339 or 340.

Origen, the son of Leonidas the martyr, was born in Egypt A. D. 184 or

Eusebius says;[1]—"It seems therefore proper here to give

185, and early made great proficiency in knowledge. He taught at Alexandria and Cæsarea. His writings were so extremely numerous that Jerome says, "He wrote more than any other man could read." After having spent a life of astonishing activity in the cause of Christianity, and suffered much in the Decian persecution (A. D. 250) he died in the 70th year of his age. S.]

[1] *Ευλογον δ' ενταυθα γενομενους, ανακεφαλαιωσασθαι τας δηλωθεισας* της καινης διαθηκης γραφας· και δη τακτεον εν πρωτοις, την ἁγιαν των ευαγγελιων τετρακτην· οἰς ἑπεται ἡ των πραξεων των Αποστολων γραφη· μετα δε ταυτην, τας Παυλου καταλεκτεον επιστολας· αἰς ἑξης την φερομενην Ἰωαννου προτεραν, και ὁμοιως την Πετρου κυρωτεον επιστολην. Επι τουτοις τακτεον, ειγε φανειη, την αποκαλυψιν Ἰωαννου· (περι ἡς τα δοξαντα κατα καιρον εκθησομεθα). Και ταυτα μεν εν ὁμολογουμενοις. Των δ' αντιλεγομενων, γνωριμων δ' ουν ὁμως τοις πολλοις, ἡ λεγομενη Ἰακωβου φερεται και ἡ Ἰουδα· ἡτε Πετρου δευτερα επιστολη, και ἡ ονομαζομενη δευτερα και τριτη Ἰωαννου· ειτε του ευαγγελιστου τυγχανουσαι, ειτε και ἑτερου ὁμωνυμου εκεινῳ. Εν τοις νοθοις κατατεταχθω και των Παυλη πραξεων ἡ γραφη, ὁ τε λεγομενος ποιμην, και ἡ αποκαλυψις Πετρου· και προς τουτοις, ἡ φερομενη Βαρναβα επιστολη, και των Αποστολων αἱ λεγομεναι διδαχαι· ετι τε ὡς εφην, ἡ Ἰωαννου αποκαλυψις, ει φανειη, ἡν τινες, ὡς εφην, αθετουσιν, ἑτεροι δε εγκρινουσι τοις ὁμολογουμενοις. Ηδη δ' εν τουτοις τινες και το καθ' Ἑβραιους ευαγγελιον κατελεξαν, ᾧ μαλιστα Ἑβραιων οἱ τον Χριστον παραδεξαμενοι χαιρουσι. Ταυτα μεν παντα των αντιλεγομενων αν ειη· αναγκαιως δε και τουτων ὁμως τον καταλογον πεποιημεθα, διακρινοντες τας τε κατα την εκκλησιαστικην παραδοσιν αληθεις και απλαστους και ανωμολογημενας γραφας, και τας αλλας παρα ταυτας, ουκ ενδιαθηκους μεν, αλλα και αντιλεγομενας, ὁμως δε παρα πλειστοις των εκκλησιαστικων γιγνωσκομενας· ἱν' ειδεναι εχοιμεν αυτας τε ταυτας, και τας ονοματι των Αποστολων προς των αἱρετικων προφερομενας· ητοι ὡς Πετρου και Θωμα και Ματθια, η και τινων παρα τουτους αλλων ευαγγελια περιεχουσας· η ὡς Ανδρεου και Ἰωαννου και των αλλων Αποστολων πραξεις· ὡν ουδεν ουδαμως εν συγγραμματι των κατα διαδοχας εκκλησιαστικων τις ανηρ εις μνη-*

* Vogel, who, in his Program. p. 3—8, has illustrated this passage with distinguished perspicuity, explains, p. 4, the word *δηλωθεισας* thus:—libros quos in *ενδιαθηκους* referendos esse, manifestum est et extra controversiam positum, i. e. books which were beyond all doubt received into the canon of the New Testament. He therefore makes it refer solely to the homologoumena.

a catalogue of the writings of the New Covenant to which we have alluded. The *four holy evangelists* must be placed first. After these must follow the book of the *Acts of the apostles;* after that are to be placed the *epistles of Paul.* The first *epistle of John* and also *that of Peter* are then to succeed. After these, if it is thought proper, may be placed the *Apocalypse of John*, the opinions relative to which we will mention in due time. And these belong to the *homologoumena.* But to the *antilegomena*, which yet are well known to many, belong those which are called the *epistle of James* and *of Jude:* also the *second epistle of Peter*, and those which are considered the *second and third of John*, whether written by the evangelist or some other person of the same name. With the spurious are to be reckoned the *Acts of Paul*, and what is called the *Shepherd*, and *the Revelation of Peter.* And to these are to be added the reputed epistle of *Barnabas*, and the so called *Instructions of the Apostles;* and if thought proper, the *Revelation of St. John* may be added, which, as has been stated, some reject, and others class among the *homologoumena.* There have likewise been some who placed among these the *Hebrew gospel*, which is prized more especially by the Hebrews who have embraced Christianity. Now all these may be classed with the *antilegomena.* Nor is it indeed without necessity, that we have made a catalogue of these books also, in order that we may distinguish those writings, which, according to the traditionary

---

μην αγαγειν ηξιωσεν· πορρω δε που και ὁ της φρασεως παρα το ηθος το αποστολικον εναλλαττει χαρακτηρ· ἡ τε γνωμη και ἡ των εν αυτοις φερομενων προαιρεσις, πλειστον ὁσον της αληθους ορθοδοξιας απᾳδουσα, ὁτι δη αἱρετικων ανδρων αναπλασματα τυγχανει, σαφως παρισιησιν· ὁθεν ουδ' εν νοθοις αυτα καταταχτεον, αλλ' ως ατοπα πανιη και δυσσεβη παραιτητεον. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. III. 25. In order to render this and the subsequent Illustrations more intelligible, the translator has transferred this quotation from a note on the fourth illustration to this place, and inserted in the text a literal version.

opinion of the church, are not fictitious but genuine and universally acknowledged, from others which, although they were disputed, were known to the greater part of ecclesiastical writers. And again, that we may discriminate between these and such as the heretics brought forward, under pretence of their being productions of the Apostles; such as the *gospels of Peter* and *Thomas* and *Matthias*, and some others, and the *Acts of Andrew* and *of John* and *of the other Apostles;* which not one of the whole list of ecclesiastical writers has ever thought worthy of being quoted. The character of their diction is very diverse from the style of the Apostles: and the spirit and tendency of their contents deviate so entirely from the true doctrines, as clearly to prove them to be the fabrications of heretics. Hence they cannot be classed even with the spurious writings; but must be denounced as absurd and impious."

The principal passage of Origen may be seen in his Commentary on Matthew and John, preserved by Eusebius.[1]

It is true that in these passages, neither Eusebius nor Origen specifies the number of the universally received writings of the apostle Paul. But it is evident from other passages of Eusebius, that the epistle to the Hebrews is the only one which was not received into the number of the homologoumena. He says,[2] "The fourteen epistles of Paul are well known (*προδηλοι και σαφεις*)[3]; yet it ought not to be concealed that some have excluded the epistle to the Hebrews, alleging that the church at Rome deny (*αντιλεγεσθαι*) it to be Paul's:" and in another passage he remarks, that the epistle to the Hebrews *παρα Ῥωμαιων τισιν ου νομιζεται του Ἀποστολου τυγχανειν*,[4]

1 Eccles. Hist. VI. 25. 2 Euseb. Hist. Eccles. III. 3.

3 In "New Apology for the Revelation of St. John," (published, Tübingen, 1783) p. 28 note 15, it is remarked that the expressions *προδηλος* and *σαφης* (well known) must be distinguished from *ὁμολογουμενος* universally received.

4 Euseb. VI. 20.

is by some Romans not regarded as a production of the apostle (Paul). And he elsewhere[1] classes this epistle with the antilegomena, i. e. with those books which were not universally received. In like manner Origen[2] excludes none but the epistle to the Hebrews from the universally received apostolical writings; and all the other epistles of Paul, he attributes, without the least hesitation, to that apostle, in innumerable instances; excepting that to Philemon, which from its extreme brevity would naturally be but seldom quoted; and yet even this epistle is in one passage expressly ascribed to Paul.[3] Yet Origen was much disposed to express his doubts relative to the antilegomena; and it has been proved that he distinguished them from the homologoumena, by his manner of quoting them.[4] Thus in his Commentary on John,[5] he quotes the first epistle of James with these words, *ὡς εν τῃ φερομενῃ τυ Ιακωβυ επιστολῃ ανεγνωμεν*, i. e. as we read in the reputed epistle of James; and in his Commentary on Matt.[6] when citing the epistle of Jude, he adds, *ει δε και την Ιουδα προσοιτο τις επιστολην*, i. e. if we acknowledge the epistle of Jude. Thus also in his letter to Africanus,[7] although he there undertakes to prove Paul to be the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, still when pressed with the objection that it was not genuine, he waves the quotation which he had made from it, and passes on to another proof from Matthew. But still stronger are the terms in which he expresses himself when citing the Pastor of Hermas, which he regarded as a divine book;[8] *ει δε χρη τολμησαντα και απο τινος φερομενης μεν εν τῃ εκκλησιᾳ γραφης, ου παρα πασι δε ὁμολογυμενης ειναι θειας,*

---

1 Hist. Eccles. VI. 13. 2 Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25.

3 In the 19th Homily on Jeremiah, §. 2.

4 See the Apology for the Revelation § 6, note 2; and the work "On the object of the gospel history and the epistles of John," p. 106, &c. Tübingen 1786.

5 Tom. XIX. § 6. 6 Tom. XVII. § 30. 7 § 9.

8 Lib. X. in Epist. ad Romanos, § 31.

κ.τ.λ. i. e. if we may venture to quote from a book that is commonly used by the church, yet not received as divine by the unanimous consent of all. And he himself informs us, that he cited passages from such books, "non ad auctoritatem, sed ad manifestationem propositæ quaestionis," i. e. not for the proof, but illustration of the point under discussion.[1] The principal passages of Origen, in which he quotes the Epistles, are the following:—

For the Epistle to the Romans and the first of Corinthians, see Orig. contra Celsum, Lib. III. § 46—48.

For the second of Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians, idem Lib. I. § 48. 47. II. § 1.

For the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians, Lib. VI. § 54. Lib. IV. § 49. 18. Preface, § 5.

For the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, Lib. V. § 17. Lib. VI. § 45, etc.

For the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, Lib. I. § 63. Lib. IV. § 70. Lib. III. § 48.

In like manner also the Acts of the Apostles, Origen expressly attributed to Luke; ὡς ὁ Λουκας εν ταις πραξεσιν των αποστολων εγραφε,[2] i. e. as Luke in the Acts of the Apostles has declared. And the reason why he did not mention the book of Acts in the passages which Eusebius quotes from his Commentary on Matthew and John, was that Origen there wished to speak only of the Gospels, and of the writings of the apostles Paul, Peter, and John.

---

1 Vide Mag. für christliche Dogmatik und Moral, Stück 9. S. 17—26.

2 Lib. VI. contra Celsum, § 11. See also the passage which Eusebius quotes from his Homilies on the Hebrews, Euseb. Hist. Eccl. VI. 25.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The reference of Eusebius and Origen to the ecclesiastical tradition respecting the homologoumena; together with remarks on the nature of this tradition.

The passages in which this reference is contained, are those quoted in the last Illustration; together with another passage,[1] in which Eusebius remarks, that the Gospel and first Epistle of John, which were classed with the homologoumena in ch. 25, were without the least hesitation received as genuine by the ancient and the present church.

Relative to the nature of this tradition, Eusebius, in his principal passage above quoted at length, uses the following language: *αἱ κατα την εκκλησιαστικην παραδοσιν αληθεις και απλαστοι και ἀνωμολογημεναι γραφαι;* i. e. the books which according to the tradition of the church are generally received as true and unadulterated; and Origen says (Euseb. Ec. Hist. VI. 25.) *ὡς εν παραδοσει μαθων*; i. e. as I have learned from tradition. That by this *εκκλησιαστικη παραδοσις* is not meant the oral declarations of the contemporaries of Eusebius, is proved in the Apology for the Revelation,[2] where it is evinced that this phrase of Eusebius signifies the testimony of writers, and especially of those prior to his day. This opinion is more fully discussed by Dr Flatt in his magazine,[3] and vindicated against different significations which have of late been given to that phrase as used by Eusebius. Eckermann, in his dissertation "On the probable origin of the gospels and the Acts of the apostles,"[4] regards the word tradition in general, and also in the passage of Origen above quoted, as the then prevalent tenet or opinion of the church. According to his idea therefore, Eusebius and Origen

---

1 Hist. Euseb. III. 24. 2 p. 26. note 7.

3 See Flatt's Magazin für christliche Dogmatik und Moral, achtes Stück s. 75—86.

4 Theologische Beitræge (Theological Contributions) Band 5 Stück 2.

acknowledged the genuineness of the homologoumena for this reason, that it was a settled opinion of the church that the gospel of Matthew or of John &c, was really written by the person whose name it bears. The ground therefore of their reception of them was, that their genuineness was a traditionary dogma of the church. In the "Essay on the Canon of Eusebius," by J. E. C. Schmidt,[1] that writer explains the *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη* as signifying the Canon which was settled by the church of Eusebius. And Münscher thinks it signifies the prevailing opinion of the Christian churches relative to the books of the New Testament; and adds that the private opinion of Eusebius, as well as of other learned men, may possibly have been at variance with it.[2] The principal proof that *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη* signifies *written tradition*, or the testimony of those authors with whose works Eusebius was acquainted, is found in the leading passage itself relative to the canon.[3] Here Eusebius describes the first class of sacred writings, the homologoumena, in the words before cited: *αι κατα την εκκλησιαστικην παραδοσιν αληθεις απλαστοι και ανωμολογημεναι γραφαι* i. e. books which according to the tradition of the church are generally received as true and unadulterated; but relative to the later class, that of heretical writings, he uses these words: *ων ουδεν οδαμως εν ΣΥΓΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙ των κατα διαδοχας εκκλησιαστικων τις ανηρ εις μνημην αγαγειν ηξιωσε*, i. e. whom not a single one of the whole succession of ecclesiastical writers, has thought worthy of being quoted. The same idea is elsewhere[4] thus expressed: *μητε αρχαιων μητε των καθ' ημας τις εκκλησιαστικος συγγραφευς ταις εξ' αυτων συνεχρησατο μαρτυριαις*, i. e. no ecclesiastical writer, either in ancient or modern times,

1 Henke's Mag. für Religions Philosophie (Mag. for Religious Philosophy) Band V. Stück III. s. 451, &c.

2 Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte (Manual of the History of the christian doctrines) Marpurg 1797. vol. I. p. 246.

3 See that passage quoted in Illust. 1. supra. 4 III. 3.

has ever made any use of their testimony. The descriptions of these two classes of books, are evidently correlative; and as the latter class is distinguished by the total want of testimony of writers in their favour, so by virtue of their antithetic relation, the former must have in their favour the testimony of all the writers whose works were extant, that is the *παραδοσιν εκκλησιαστικην*. Vogel[1] gives this sense of *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη*; "Judicium ecclesiae antiquitus traditum" i. e. the judgment of the church transmitted from former ages; and subjoins this remark: certum est, *παραδοσιν εκκλησιαστικην* vel confirmari, vel nullam esse demonstrari, ex scriptorum testimoniis vel silentio, i. e. it is clear that the *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη* may either be confirmed or be proved a nullity, by the testimony or silence of writers. According to this explanation *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη* would signify "the judgment of the church, relative to the origin and authority of the sacred writings, derived from historical transmission:" and this historical transmission is identical with the testimony of writers, especially the more ancient ones.— This explanation, it is self-evident, detracts nothing from the weight of the *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη*.

[The true signification of the phrase *παραδοσις εκκλησιαστικη* may, perhaps not unaptly, be illustrated by a passage of the Apostle Paul, in which the word *παραδοσις* is used and its import determined by the context: "therefore, brethren, be steadfast, and hold the traditions (*τας παραδοσεις*) which ye have been taught, whether orally or by our epistle." Tradition, therefore, would signify any historical account or opinion transmitted to us from former ages, whether orally or by writing; and *εκκλησιαστικη* would point us to persons connected with the church, as the channel through which it was transmitted. S.]

[1] Commentationes de Canone Eusebiano, Pt. I. p. 7. n. 9. Erlangen, 1809.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The testimony of all the writers known to Origen and Eusebius was in favour of the homologoumena.

The following passages from Eusebius may be adduced, as proof that the homologoumena were supported by the unanimous testimony of all whose opinion that very learned man had read. Relative to the first epistle of John, he remarks:[1] *παρα τε τοις νυν και τοις ετ' αρχαιοις αναμφιλεκτος ὡμολογηται* i. e. it was acknowledged as genuine, without contradiction, in earlier as well as later times. And in the same place, he terms the books of John, (which he afterwards classed with the homologoumena,[2]) *τουδε του αποστολου αναντιρρητοι γραφαι* i. e. the productions of this apostle, which had never been disputed.

In the work entitled "The design of the gospel and epistles of John"[3] the fact is established, in refutation of Merkel,[4] that Origen and Eusebius never termed any books *ὁμολογουμενα*, excepting such as were unanimously, and without any exception, acknowledged as genuine. Accordingly they could not have given this appellation to books, which were merely supported by some testimony, with which other testimony might be at variance. Origen remarks of the four Evangelists, that *αναντιρρητα εστιν εν τῃ ὑπο τον ουρανον εκκλησιᾳ θεου* i. e. they are every where received without contradiction by the whole church of God. The same universal coincidence of testimony is signified by the term *καθολικος* (universal), which Origen and his disciple Dionysius apply to the first epistle of John.[5] And the idea that the second and third epistle of John are not *ὁμολογουμενα* but *αντιλεγομενα*,[6] is expressed by Origen thus: *ου παν-*

---

[1] III. 24. [2] III. 25. [3] p. 113, &c.

[4] See Merkel's "Proof that the Apocalypse is a spurious book."

[5] Euseb. VII. 25. Compare Noesselt's Conjecturæ ad historiam catholicæ Jacobi epistolæ, in the Opuscula ad interpretationem, etc. etc. Fasc. II. p. 304, &c. Halle, 1787.

[6] Euseb. VI. 25.

τες γνησιους φασι ταυτας, i. e. they are not pronounced genuine by all. Now if these words contain a definition of αντιλεγομενον, it follows by virtue of the antithesis, that ὁμολογουμενον must signify a book ο παντες φασι γνησιον, i. e. which all acknowledge to be genuine.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Proof that the testimony of Origen and Eusebius relative to the books termed homologoumena, refers specifically to their genuineness.

It is evident that the passages, which Eusebius quotes[1] from Origen, refer to the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, that is, to the question whether they are really the productions of the persons to whom they are ascribed. For in the passage just referred to, Origen speaks not only of the four Gospels, but of the authors of them, whom he individually names. He mentions for whose use, and for what purpose each apostle wrote, and expresses himself thus: Πετρος μιαν επιστολην ὁμολογουμενην καταλελοιπε—Ἰωαννης εναγγελιον ἐν καταλελοιπεν—εγραφε δε και την αποκαλυψιν—καταλελοιπε δε και επιστολην πανυ ολιγων στιχων· εστω δε και δευτεραν και τριτην· επει ου παντες φασι ΓΝΗΣΙΟΥΣ ειναι ταυτας, i. e. Peter has left us one epistle which is universally attributed to him—John has left one Gospel—he also wrote the Apocalypse—he also left us an epistle of very few lines; and perhaps also a second and a third, for not all agree in pronouncing the two last genuine.

Relative to the testimony of Eusebius himself,[2] it is certain that by terming these books (mentioned above in §. 2.) ὁμολογουμενα, he meant that they were unanimously received as *genuine*. For he distinguishes between these homologoumena, or books universally received as genuine, and the νοθα or αντιλεγομενα, which were books whose genuineness was not universally admitted, but was disputed by some.

---

1 VI, 25. 2 See his main passage, Illustration 1, of this §.

That Eusebius did not intend, by the term *νοθα*, to designate such writings as were universally regarded as spurious; but meant books whose genuineness was denied by some and acknowledged by others, is evident from the following considerations. In the first place, Eusebius, in his main passage, most explicitly distinguishes between the *νοθα* and a third class of writings, which were fabricated by heretics, *αἱρετικων ανδρων αναπλασματα*, and which deviated entirely from the true doctrines, *της αληθους ορθοδοξιας απαδοντα*, (or are, as he elsewhere[1] expresses himself, remote from the true apostolical doctrines, *της αποστολικης ορθοδοξιας αλλοτρια*· and which he designates by the appellation *παντελως νοθα* i.e. altogether spurious. He expressly states, *ουδε εν νοθοις αυτα καταταχτεον*, that they cannot be reckoned to the class of *νοθων*· for they were treated with such contempt by all the writers of the church, that there was not even any dispute about their spuriousness. Secondly: Eusebius uses the terms *νοθον* and *αντιλεγομενον* as synonymous. Thus in one place,[2] he classes the epistle of James with the *αντιλεγομενα*· and in another,[3] he remarks of the same epistle *ιστεον ὡς νοθευεται*, which words must be rendered, It should be remembered, that it is regarded as not genuine by some. For immediately preceding this we read, "thus much of James, from whom the first of the reputed catholic epistles is said to be derived, *τοιαυτα και τα κατα τον Ιακωβον, ὑ ἡ πρωτη των ονομαζομενων Καθολικων επιστολων ειναι λεγεται.* This *λεγεται* necessarily refers to those who ascribed this epistle to James. In like manner the Actus Pauli, the Pastor of Hermas and the epistle of Barnabas, all of which are classed with the *νοθα* in III, 25 are in other places, quoted as writings which are not *ὁμολογουμενα*, but disputed by some (*ἀ προς τινων αντιλελεκται*);[4] and he terms them *αντιλεγομενοι*, as for example the epistle of Barnabas.[5] In addition to these evidences of the use

[1] III, 31. [2] III, 25. [3] II, 23. [4] III, 3. [5] VI. 13.

of *αντιλεγομενον* and *νοθον* as synonymes by Eusebius, two others of a decisive character, derived from the principal passage so often quoted, are adduced in the "New Apology for the Revelation of St John."[1] The first is founded on the words *εν τοις νοθοις καταταξθω ΚΑΙ*, i. e. among the books which are not received as genuine must *also* be numbered. Now what can this *ΚΑΙ*, *also*, signify, if the books which he had described as *νοθα* did not belong to the same class with those which he had immediately before mentioned as *αντιλεγομενα*?[2] The second proof is in the concluding words of the enumeration of the *νοθων*; "now all these may be classed with the antilegomena or disputed books:" *ταυτα μεν παντα των αντιλεγομενων αν ειη.* These concluding words correspond with the phrase *και ταυτα μεν εν ὁμολογουμενοις* (and these all belong to the homologoumena), which terminates a preceding enumeration of the *ὁμολογουμενα* in the earlier part of the passage; and they indicate that all the books which had been enumerated between these two phrases, belong to the same class of *αντιλεγομενων* or *νοθων*. It is evident therefore that, in the phraseology of Eusebius, these are synonymous words. And this translation of the word *νοθος* as signifying "considered not genuine," is authorized by a very customary mode of expression, according to which "to be genuine" is synonymous with "to be considered genuine."[3] It is indeed an opinion entertained by many learned men, that Eusebius in this noted passage makes a fourfold division, into (1) *ὁμολογουμενα*, (2) *αντιλεγομενα*, (3) *νοθα*, and (4) *ατοπα και δυσσεβη* (*παντελως νοθα*), absurd and impious (altogether spurious). But the arguments in opposition to this opinion, and in favour of a

[1] Note 16. § 4. p. 28, 29.

[2] Compare the notice of "Weber's Beiträge, i. e. Weber's Contributions to the History of the New Testament canon," contained in the Tübingen Gelehrten Anzeigen, Jahrg. 1790. p. 797. and Vogel's Comment. de canone Eusebiano, Pt. I. p. 5. not. 6. Pt. II. 1810. p. 8.

[3] See Observationes ad Analogiam et Syntaxin Hebraicam pertinentes, p. 14. n. 2, Tübingen, 1776.

triple division, are fully stated and vindicated in the "Dissertation on the Canon of Eusebius," in Flatt's Magazine;[1] and by the author of the Comment, (Sup. cit. P. II. p. 3—10.) who adopts the triple division, and remarks, "that Eusebius may have used the milder term *αντιλεγομενα* in reference to the Canon of his own church at Caesarea, in which the five catholic epistles are contained; and then, by the subsequent phrase *εν τοις νοθοις κατατεταχθω και* may have intended to intimate that in his judgment the severer term *νοθα* might have been applied to those five catholic epistles, just as well as to the Acts of Paul, the Pastor of Hermas &c, which were enumerated after them." Nor is the explanation of *ὁμολογουμενα* and *νοθα* in the preceding pages, as signifying a genuineness that was acknowledged by all, and a genuiness that was disputed by some, inconsistent with the fact that Eusebius classes among the *νοθα* or *αντιλεγομενα* (the books of disputed genuineness), the Gospel of the Hebrews; for this work was regarded as a genuine apostolical production by the Ebionites, or as Eusebius terms them, *τοις ἑβραιοις τον Χριστον παραδεξαμενοις*, the Hebrews who believed in Christ. And though it is certain that by some it was believed to be spurious; yet there might be others who regarded it as belonging to the homologoumena, so far as the ground-work of it was the authentic and universally received text of the gospel of Matthew. In regard to the words of Eusebius, *ηδε δ' εν τουτοις τινες και το καθ' ἑβραιους ευαγγελιον κατελεξαν*, although Michaelis considers it as uncertain whether *τουτοις* refers to *ὁμολογουμενοις* or to *νοθοις*,[2] I have no hesitation in considering it as referring to the former. For *νοθοις* is much more remote from *τουτοις* than *ὁμολογουμενοις* which just precedes it; and Eusebius was interested in detracting from the weight of the opinion of those who classed the Apocalypse with the

[1] Flatt's Mag. vol 7. p. 228—237.

[2] Michaelis Introduction to New Test. III. ed. p. 893. IV. ed. 1033 &c.

homologoumena, which he accomplished by remarking, that the case of the gospel of the Hebrews was similar to that of the Apocalypse.[1] But the fact that Eusebius himself (as Masch contends) did not class the gospel of the Hebrews with the homologoumena, but referred it to the antilegomena, is evident, partly from the circumstance of his not mentioning it earlier, whilst enumerating the homologoumena; and still more clearly from his own words, for he says that only *some* (τινες) have assigned to this gospel a place among the universally received books of the New Testament. And it is by no means a difficult matter to perceive how these *some* were led to assign it this place, if we compare the following passages of Jerome concerning this gospel. In the "Catalogus virorum illustrium," s. v. Matthaeus, he says: "Matthew—composed the gospel of Christ in the Hebrew language, and wrote it with Hebrew letters; but who the person was that subsequently translated it into Greek, is not satisfactorily known. There is, moreover, at present in the Cæsarean library, for which we are indebted to the distinguished zeal and industry of the martyr Pamphilus, a copy of the Hebrew itself. And it was by the Nazarenes of Beroea, a city of Syria, who use this book, that I was enabled to make a transcript of it."[2] Now, agreeably to the context, this "ipsum Hebraicum" can refer to nothing else than the gospel of Matthew.—Again in his Dialog. contra Pelagianos we read: "In the Hebrew gospel according to the apostles, or as is generally supposed, according to Matthew, which is indeed written in the Syro-Chaldaic language, but with Hebrew letters, which the Nazarenes use even at the present day, and which is found in the

1 Vide Vogel's Comment. P. I. p. 6. n. 8.

2 "Matthaeus—Evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit: quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaraeis, qui in Beroea urbe Syriae hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit."

library at Cæsarea,"[1] &c. Again; "In the gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which I lately translated from Hebrew into Greek, and which is by most persons called the authentic gospel of Matthew," &c.[2] Now as Jerome professes[3] that the gospel of the Nazarenes is the Hebrew gospel of Matthew, ipsum Hebraicum, authenticum Matthæi, juxta Matthæum, and yet himself quotes passages from the Nazarene gospel which are not found in our Matthew; we are led to suppose that the original text of Matthew was the groundwork of the Nazarene gospel, but that additions had been made to it. And as far as the text of Matthew was the ground work of the gospel of the Nazarenes or Hebrews, it might have been ranked by some among the homologoumena. Schmidt does indeed suppose that Jerome at first believed the Hebrew gospel which he transcribed and translated, to be the Hebrew gospel of Matthew; and that he subsequently changed his opinion. But if Jerome, according to the first of the passages above quoted, in which he calls the gospel of the Hebrews "ipsum Hebraicum Matthaei," did transcribe it and had already translated it into Greek and Latin, as we learn from the preceeding passage in the context; it follows that he must at that time have been intimately acquainted with it.[4]

---

1 "In Evangelio juxta Hebraeos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive ut plerique autumant juxta Matthaeum, quod et in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca," etc. Dial. cont. Pelag. Lib. III. 2.

2 In Evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebraico sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum, etc. Comment. in Matt. XII. 13.

3 See the work "on the Object of the Gospel and Epistles of John," p. 285 &c. 395, &c

4 See J. E. C. Schmidt's "Dissertation on the lost gospels," in Henke's Magazine for Religious Philosophy, Exegesis &c. Vol. IV, pt 3. p. 576 &c. and his Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte, pt I. p 390 &c. and Historico-critical Introduction to the New Test. pt I. Giessen 1804, p 111. On the gospel of the Hebrews, the reader is also referred to the Dissert. sup. cit. of the Magazine, pt 8. p. 95—99. and in addition to the works there named in p. 96. not. 32, the following works: Eichhorn's

We would yet remark, that it was not the intention of Eusebius, in his main passage quoted in Ill. 1, to give a general catalogue of all the homologoumena, that is, of all the writings of Christians which were acknowledged to be genuine; (among which, for example, the first epistle of Clemens must be classed; for this he elsewhere also calls *ὁμολογουμενη επιστολη*, [1] and *ανωμολογουμενη παρα πασιν επιστολη*, and *ὁμολογουμενη γραφη*· [2]) but his object was to enumerate only those homologoumena, which belonged to the *collection of the books of the New Testament*, *δηλωθεισαι ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ γραφαι*. But the question in this place is not what opinion had the ancient Christians of the divine authority of certain books, and according to what principles did they decide on their admission into the canon, that is, into the number of divine books; but our sole object at present, is to establish by their testimony the position that these are genuine books. And most assuredly their testimony does establish, firmly and indisputably, the fact that the homologoumena of the New Testament are homologoumena indeed; that is, that they are writings which are, beyond all doubt, the productions of those persons to whom they are ascribed; and that the reason why they were adopted into the number of the religious books of the church, and received as authentic records of the history and doctrines of christianity, was no other than this, that they were universally believed to be the genuine productions of those disciples of Jesus whose names they bear.

Introduction to the New Test. vol. I. p. 6—38. 1804; a Review of this Introd. in the Haller Literatur Zeitung for 1805, No. 127; Weber's New Investigation of the antiquity and authority of the gospel of the Hebrews, Tübingen, 1806. Tübing. Gelehrter Anzeigen 1806. pt. 6. p. 41 &c.

1 Euseb. III, 16.

2 III. 38. Vide Vogel's Program. sup. cit. P. I. p. 22 s. P. II. p. 13 s.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Fragments of earlier writers; and proof that they actually regarded the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen epistles of Paul, and the first epistle of John and first of Peter, as the genuine productions of those disciples of Jesus to whom they are ascribed.

Of these relics, some are entire books, which were written before the time of Origen; others are single passages of more ancient writers, which are found as quotations in later authors, especially in Eusebius. Eusebius himself informs us,[1] that in the perusal of earlier writings, he was attentive to the information contained in them relative to the several books of the holy Scriptures; and that he noted, with particular care, the passages quoted from those books of the Christians which belong to the antilegomena. Some of the few written documents of the earlier christian age, which have been preserved entire, are of a polemical nature, being directed against the Pagans or Jews, who were but partially acquainted with the books of the New Testament; and others are so small as to contain but a few pages. It would therefore be unreasonable to expect that we should be able to adduce many passages, from very ancient writings, for the authenticity of the homologoûmena; especially, as we shall appeal only to those ancient writings of whose integrity we have no doubt; and even from these, shall adduce only such passages as quote the homologoumena, not in an indefinite manner, but with the express mention of the author's name. For such quotations as contain passages of a book of the New Testament, without specifying the name of the author, may indeed evince the antiquity of the book, but can never be advanced in support of its integrity. These passages are collected by Professor Less, in his work entitled "Ueber die Religion, ihre Wahl and Bestätigung."[2]

---

1 Ecc. Hist. III, 3.

2 Part I. page 503 &c. On the citations of the N. Test. contained in the most ancient ecclesiastical writers, vide Hug's Introduction to the N. Test. part I. § 7. p. 34—38.

Among the ancient witnesses for the homologoumena, who quote them specifying the authors' name, are the nine following.

1. *Polycarp*, the bishop of Smyrna and disciple of St. John. He ascribes the epistle to the Philippians, and the first epistle to the Corinthians to Paul. For in his letter to the Philippians, he expressly states, that Paul wrote to them. In § 11. he quotes 1 Cor. 6: 2. adding: sicut Paulus docet, i. e. as we learn from Paul. He elsewhere makes quotations also from the epistle to the Ephesians and the first epistle to Timothy, and the first of Peter, and of John, but without specifying the author's name.[1]

2. *Papias*,[2] bishop of Hierapolis, quoted by Eusebius,[3] testifies, that Mark, the disciple of Peter, and Matthew recorded the actions and declarations of our Lord. He says:[4] "Mark, who was the interpreter of Peter, made an accurate record of whatsoever he recollected; though not in the order in which the things were said and done by Christ. He was particularly careful, neither to omit any thing which he had heard, nor to insert any thing which was false. Matthew wrote his gospel[5]

1 On the genuineness of the epistle of Polycarp, which is disputed by many, see J. E. C. Schmidt's Manual of the history of the christian church part I. p. 213. 446 &c. Schmidt, in his Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese des A. & N. Test. Vol. III. pt. 2. p. 299—310, derives evidence of the early existence of the epistles of Paul to the Corinthians and Ephesians, from the Epistles of Ignatius: having first presupposed, that only the shorter epistles are unadulterated, or that what is found both in the larger and smaller epistles, is alone the work of the original author.

2 [Papias flourished, according to Cave, A. D. 110; or as others contend, about 115. He is said by Iraeneus, to have been a companion of Polycarp and one of St. John's hearers. S.]

3 Eusebius, His. Eccl. III. 39, the end.

4 *Μαρκος ἑρμηνευτης Πετρου γενομενος, ὁσα εμνημονευσεν, ακριβως εγραψε· ου μεντοι ταξει τα ὑπο του Χριστου η λεχθεντα η πραχθεντα·—ἑνος εποιησατο προνοιαν, του μηδεν ὡν ηκουσε παραλιπειν, η ψευσασθαι τι εν αυτοις.—Ματθαιος ἑβραϊδι διαλεκτῳ τα λογια συνεγραψατο· ἡρμηνευσε δ' αυτα, ὡς ηδυνατο, ἑκαστος.*

5 That *λογια* here signifies gospel or written narrative of the history and doctrines of Jesus, is evident partly from the customary use of the word, and partly from the corespondence of the *λογιων* of Matthew with the written record of the actions and declarations of Jesus, made by Mark,

in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted it as well as he could." Eusebius informs us, in the part of his work above referred to, that Papias also made quotations from the first epistle of Peter and first of John. But it may be questioned whether he ascribes them to those apostles by a specific mention of their names. For Eusebius asserts, in like manner, that Polycarp quoted some passages from the first epistle of Peter; and yet we learn from the epistle of Polycarp itself, that the name of the author is not annexed to the passages cited.[1]

3. *Justin Martyr.*[2] From the writings of Justin, it may be inferred that the gospel of Mark belongs to the apostle Peter, whose disciple Mark was; but that the gospel of Luke was derived from a disciple of some apostle, who, according to collateral evidence, could have been no other than the apostle Paul. Moreover, the *απομνημονευματα των αποστολων* or Memorabilia of the Apostles, (the gospel to which the aged Justin had been accustomed in his own country, Samaria,) presuppose not only the high antiquity of the gospel of Luke, but also the early existence of our gospel of Matthew; just as the apocryphal gospels, in general, of which Justin's is one, are not an evidence against the antiquity of our gospels, but very clearly establish their age; because it is evident from all the apocryphal gospels which have descended to us, that their authors were acquainted with our gospels.[3] Nor will the fact, that Justin quotes almost exclusively such books as were known in his native country, (although,

εγραψε τα ὑπο του Χριστου η λεχθεντα η πραχθεντα. In the work (of Dr Storr) "On the object of St John's Gospel, the author proves that *λογια* or *λογοι* (דְּבָרִים) is synonymous with res, p. 250.

1 Euseb. IV. 14. Polycarp, Epist. §§ I. II. VIII.

2 [Justin, surnamed the Martyr, was, as Methodius states, not far removed from the apostles either in time or virtue. Fabricius supposes he was born about A. D. 89; and the time of his martyrdom is variously fixed by the learned, from A. D. 164 to 168. He was born at Sichem the well known city of Samaria. S.]

3 Vide Paulus' Supplement to Commentary on the New Testament, p. 81 &c.

in the course of his travels, he doubtless became acquainted with other apostolical epistles,) appear any longer strange, when we recollect that none of his works have reached us, excepting such as were addressed to the enemies of his religion. For other apologists of Christianity, especially Tertullian, rarely quote the N. Test. in their apologies and polemical writings, (except the historical books to which they were compelled to appeal in support of facts,) yet Tertullian often cites the homologoumena in his other works. Had the production of Justin, entitled De monarchia Dei, reached us entire, in which, as Eusebius informs us,[1] he quotes not only Pagan but also Christian writings, *τας παρ' ἡμιν γραφας*, i. e. our Scriptures; or had his work against Marcion, whom he could not refute without a reference to St. Paul, escaped the ravages of time; we doubt not that we should have it in our power to adduce Justin as a witness for others of the books of the New Testament.

In the work "on the Object of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John,"[2] the author shows that the gospel which Justin used, and which he commonly termed *απομνημονευματα των αποστολων*, and sometimes[3] *ευαγγελιον*, and which Justin moreover says was composed by apostles of Jesus and their followers, *ὑπο αποστολων Ιησου και των αυτοις παρακολουθησαντων συντεταχθαι*,[4] was a Harmony of the gospel of the Hebrews and of the gospel of Luke. The following are the principal arguments. First: it is certain that the gospel of Matthew was the groundwork from which Justin's gospel was composed; and that the latter contained additions, which are not found in any of our gospels; but which agree with additions found in the gospel of the Hebrews; as Stroth has proved in the Repertory of Biblical and oriental literature part I. Secondly: Justin was a native of Palestine, where the gospel of the Hebrews was current; and it

1 Lib. IV. c. 18. 2 § 69. p. 363—375.

3 Dial. cum Tryph. Judaeo, Justini. opp. ed. Colon. p. 227.

4 Dial. cum Tryph. ed. cit. p. 331.

was there that he was converted to christianity. Thirdly: the name of Justin's gospel, *απομνημονευματα των αποστολων*, coincides with the appellation "Evangelium secundum apostolos," by which the gospel of the Hebrews is also denominated. Fourthly: it is an indisputable fact, that Justin's gospel contained many passages from Luke; as Paulus has proved in his "Exegetisch-critische Abhandlungen.[1] Fifthly: on the contrary, it cannot be proved that any passages from the gospel of John were inserted into the *απομνημονευματα των αποστολων*, the Memorabilia of the apostles. Sixthly: Justin does not quote the passage Mark chap. III verse 17, from the *απομνημονευμασι των αποστολων*, but from the gospel of Mark itself. His words are:[2] "And when it is said that he (Christ) denominated one of the apostles Peter, and when this is also recorded in *his* Memorabilia, together with the fact that to two others, who were brethren, the sons of Zebedee, he gave the name sons of thunder" &c. The word *αυτου* must refer to Peter, and designate in this case the gospel of Mark.

Stroth thinks the gospel of Justin was the same as the gospel of the Hebrews: Paulus regards it as a Harmony of our four gospels: Münscher[3] thinks it was a Greek translation of the gospel of the Hebrews, to which some additions were perhaps made from the gospels of Matthew and Luke. Eichhorn, who collected the fragments out of Justin's gospel entire,[4] believes that it was formed[5] out of the original gospel; that it resembled our Matthew in matter and contents, but was earlier and less

---

1 Page 25, Tübingen, 1784.

2 *Και το ειπειν μετωνομακεναι αυτον Πετρον ἑνα των αποστολων, και γεγραφθαι εν τοις απομνημονευμασιν ΑΥΤΟΥ και τουτο μετα του και αλλους δυο αδελφους, υἱους Ζεβεδαιου οντας, μετωνομακεναι ονοματι του βοανεργες*, &c. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 333.

3 Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, I ter theil, 2te auflage, Marpurg, 1802 p. 296 &c.

4 Introduction to N. Test. part I. p. 513 &c.

5 p. 141 &c.

perfect. Schmidt is of opinion that it was framed by an enlargement of our Matthew, which at that time had not fully acquired its present form.[1] The Reviewer of Eichhorn's Introduction, pronounces Justin's gospel to be the gospel of Matthew enlarged from Luke; and observes, that those additions in Justin's gospel, which are not found in Matthew or Luke, are never marked as quotations.[2] Hug maintains, that the *απομνημονευματα* of Justin were the canonical gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke; and supposes, that Justin's citation of facts from the New Testament was not literal, but free and unrestrained.[3] And finally, Feilmoser endeavours to prove, that the facts in the life of our Saviour mentioned by Justin, in some instances are not adduced as citations, and in others are narrated in terms which contain only the sense of the corresponding passages in our gospels, and may also in some cases be viewed as marginal glosses.[4]

4. *Irenaeus*,[5] who lived in the second century, in his books against the Gnostic sects of christians, quotes very many passages from all the homologoumena, and frequently specifies the names of their authors: only from the epistle to Philemon he quotes no passage, which is easily accounted for by the contents and brevity of that epistle. As an evidence that we do not attach too high importance to the testimony of Irenaeus, (which acquires the greater moment from the fact of his connexion with the churches

---

1 Schmidt's Introduction to N. Test. § 51. p. 120 &c. and 124 note 1.

2 Hallische Literatur Zeitung, 1805, No. 127.

3 Einleitung &c. i. e. Introd. to N. Test. part II. §. 23. p. 74—80.

4 Introd. to the books of the New Covenant, Inspruck 1810, § 62. p. 153 &c.

5 [Neither the birth nor the death of Irenaeus can be determined with precision. But "we have good reason," says Dr Lardner, "to believe that he was a disciple of Polycarp, that he was presbyter in the church of Lyons under Pothinus, whose martyrdom occurred A. D. 177, and that he succeeded Pothinus to the bishopric of that church." "Irenaeus," says the same excellent writer, "though his writings may not be free from imperfection, has given such proofs of learning, good sense and integrity in the main, that all good judges must esteem him an ornament to the sect he was of." Lardner's Credib. pt. II. B. I. c. 17. S.]

in Asia Minor, which had shortly before been under the care of the apostle John, and even in the time of Irenaeus embraced some who had been contemporary with the apostles,) we shall adduce a few proofs.

For *Matthew*, see Lib. III. contra Haereses c. 9. § 1, 2.

For *Mark*, the same. c. 10, § 6.

For the gospel of *Luke*, Lib. III. c. 10. § 1. c. 14. § 3.

For the gospel of *John*, Lib. III. c. 11. § 1. Compare the Repertory for Biblical and Oriental Literature, part XIV. p. 136 &c.

For the four *Gospels*, Lib. III. c. 1. § 1. c. 11. § 8. c. 15. § 1.

For the *Acts* of the Apostles, Lib. III. c. 14. § 1. c. 15. § 1.

For the epistle of Paul to the *Romans*, and both epistles to the *Corinthians*, Lib. III. c. 13. § 1. c. 16. § 3. 9. c. 18. § 2. 3. Lib. IV. c. 26. § 4.

For the epistles to the *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians* and *Colossians*, Lib. III. c. 7. § 2. c. 13. § 3. c. 16. § 3. c. 18. § 3. Lib. V. c. 13. § 2—4. Lib. III. c. 14. § 1.

For both epistles to the *Thessalonians*, Lib. V. c. 6. § 1. Lib. III. c. 6. § 5. c. 7. § 2.

For the epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, Preface to Lib. I. § 1. Lib. III. c. 3. § 3. c. 14. § 1. c. 3. § 4.

For the first epistle of *Peter* and first of *John*, Lib. IV. c. 9. § 2. Lib. V. c. 7. § 2. Lib. III. c. 16. § 5. 8.[1]

The credibility of Irenaeus' testimony to the genuineness of the books of the N. Test. is vindicated in the New Apology for the Revelation of St John,[2] against objections founded on some unguarded expressions contained in his books against the Gnostics. In a work published since the appearance of the Apology, and entitled "a Dissertation on the true and secure grounds of belief

---

[1] It is unnecessary to quote the words of Irenaeus in the passages which are here referred to, and in which he cites the individual books of the N. Test. with a specification of the author's name; as there can be no dispute about them. They are contained, together with others, in Camerer's Theologischen und kritischen Versuchen, Stuttgard 1794. 2nd Dissertation on the canon of the N. Test. § 7.

[2] p. 142—164. and the work Ueber den Zweck der evang. Geschichte Johannis &c. p. 89—94, 247—249.

of the principal facts in the history of Jesus; and on the probable origin of the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles," Eckermann has attempted to invalidate the evidence of Irenaeus in favour of the genuineness of our four gospels.[1] The works in reply to this Dissertation are, "Reflections on the origin of the four gospels and the Acts of the apostles;"[2] and a communication by Professor Süskind, in *Dr Flatt's Magazine*,"[3] in answer to the question "What were the grounds on which Irenaeus received our four gospels as genuine?"

Eckermann, in the work above referred to, attempts to invalidate the testimony of Irenaeus by saying: "Irenaeus, in the first place, appeals in general terms, to the unanimous testimony of the apostolical churches, from which and on whose authority the gospels were received. But this unanimous testimony of the christian churches, is nothing but the results of the first councils, held between A. D. 160 and 170; and which agreed in receiving our four gospels, because they unanimously believed them coincident with the doctrinal traditions of the apostolical churches, and thence concluded there could be no reason to doubt the fact, that these books were actually the productions of the persons to whom they were ascribed. And since the time of these councils, the major part of the christian churches acknowledged them as the gospels of the persons whose names they bear. Secondly: Irenaeus himself appeals to the coincidence of the four gospels with the doctrinal traditions, which were the best source and the appropriate criterion of the truth.—Thus the force of the evidence for the genuineness of our gospels must at last rest on their coincidence with the oral tradition of doctrines, which came down to them without interruption from the lips of

---

1 Theologische Beyträge Vol. V. pt. 2. 1796. p. 171—176. 184—197 comp. p. 124—135.

2 "Stäudlin's Contributions to the history of the doctrines of religion and morality," p. 185—192, where the testimony of Irenaeus is vindicated.

3 No. 6. p 95—139.

the apostles. Irenaeus does not mention the churches, from which an account of the genuineness of our gospels was derived; nor does he name any individuals who obtained such information from the lips of an apostle, or from one personally acquainted with an apostle. It is therefore, impossible that such *traditiones ecclesiasticae* (traditions of the church) should have any weight before the tribunal of impartial historical criticism. For they are too young to afford valid evidence of such a fact: and they are moreover not only contradicted by learned critics, such as Marcion; but it can be evinced from satisfactory testimony,[1] that at the commencement of the second century, these written accounts were not regarded as so unquestionable but that the oral accounts of persons conversant with the apostles, were prefered to them, as more indubitable sources of information."

The principal arguments by which these objections of Eckermann are met in the works above referred to, are the following. *First*, no passage can be found in Irenaeus, from which it might be inferred with even the semblance of truth that he received our four gospels, on account of their coincidence with the doctrinal traditions. *Secondly*, the object of Irenaeus, in his books against the Gnostics, is not to establish the genuineness of the gospels, but their validity. Their genuineness he presupposed as admitted; for the heretics against whom he was contending did not deny the genuineness of the gospels, but disputed the authority of some of them. Thus in the case of Marcion, the assertion that he denied the genuineness of the gospels is demonstrably false, as appears from the most explicit passages of Irenaeus and Tertullian. *Thirdly*, but even admitting the fact that Irenaeus rather assumes than proves the genuineness of our

---

1 The testimony alluded to is that of Papias, who says: *ου τα εκ των βιβλιων τοσουτον με ωφελειν ὑπελαμβανον, ὁσον τα παρα ζωσης φωνης και μενουσης* i. e. I did not think that I should be profited as much by what I could learn from written records, as by the oral instructions of living persons.

gospels; still it cannot be doubted that he had good historical ground for this assumption. The assumption itself may therefore, without doubt, justly be regarded as important historical evidence. *Fourthly*, the hypothesis that Irenaeus received the four gospels as genuine on the authority of certain councils, rests on a mere fiction. For, the supposition that the reception of the historical books of the New Testament, was agreed on in the councils which met between A. D. 160 and 170, and by this agreement became a dogma of the whole catholic church; is not only utterly destitute of proof, but is in itself, in the highest degree improbable.[1] But even if this pretended fact were true, still such a choice of our gospels would be entitled to a very high degree of respect; because it could not be supposed that a traditionary opinion relative to the origin of the gospels, which was a mere unfounded report very recently sprung up, could have been disseminated universally and without alteration, and have exerted an influence on all the provincial synods inducing them to make one and the same selection of books.[2] *Fifthly*, Irenaeus was connected with several churches. At Lyons, in Gaul, he was first Presbyter and then Bishop; and according to Eusebius,[3] he and his church maintained a correspondence with the Roman church. Irenaeus attached peculiar weight to

1 Compare "Reflections on the origin of the gospels and Acts of the apostles," in Stäudlin's Beyträge Vol. V. p. 195—201. Schmidt's Introduction to the N. Test. part I. § 13. "Montanism took its rise soon after the middle of the 2nd century, and in a short time spread from Phrygia to Gaul and Carthage. The Montanists and their opponents could certainly not have combined for the purpose of raising the same books to canonical authority. But as they both used our gospels, it is evident that they must have been received as canonical at an earlier date. And the history of the contentions concerning the exact time when Easter should be kept, evinces that in the second century, no synods possessed sufficient influence to effect a harmony of opinions among christians—and hence it cannot have been, that to the synods of this century we are indebted for the settling of the canon."

2 See the author's Dissertation on the Question "Did Jesus profess that his miracles were a proof of the divinity of his mission?" in Flatt's Magazine, Vol. IV. p. 236 &c.

3 Hist. Eccl. V, 4. 24.

the opinion of the churches at Smyrna and Ephesus; of the former, because Polycarp, who was the disciple of the Apostle John, and had personally known him in his early youth, (*ὁν ἑωρακαμεν και ἡμεις εν τῃ πρωτῃ ἡμων ἡλικιᾳ*,[1]) was bishop of Smyrna; and of the latter, because the apostle John resided at Ephesus until the time of Trajan.[2] And it is very probable from the passage referred to, as well as from Euseb. V. 1—3, that even when he resided in Gaul, he still was connected with these churches in Asia Minor. He moreover sometimes appeals to the testimony of persons who had personal intercourse with St. John and other apostles.[3] And consequently, in an age only 60 or 70 years remote from the apostolical, he had abundant opportunity to obtain satisfactory and indisputable testimony on the genuineness of our gospels. And even if he does, by some incredible narratives, prove himself an injudicious historian, he may nevertheless be regarded as a perfectly valid witness when the subject of investigation is the simple historical question, whether a particular book of the New Testament was acknowledged or assumed to be genuine, by persons and churches who must have had a knowledge of the fact. *Sixthly*, that our gospels are supposititious, can by no means be inferred with any justice from the words of Papias, *ου τα εκ των βιβλιων τοσουτον με ωφελειν ὑπελαμβανον, ὁσον τα παρα ζωσης φωνης και μενουσης*, i. e. I thought I should not be profited as much by what I could learn from written records, as by the oral instructions of living persons; for which purpose this is quoted by Eckermann in the extract given above. For it would be a rash conclusion indeed to infer from the declarations of Papias, the universal opinion of the Christians of his day. Again; the

---

1 Iren. Adv. Haeres. III. c. 3. § 4. Compare the epistle of Irenaeus to Florinus, preserved in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. V. c. 20.

2 Advers. Haeres. lib. III. c. 3. § 4.

3 Adv. Haereses L. II. c. 22. § 5. Lib. V. c. 30. § 1.

very passage,[1] part of which is above quoted, contains a very respectful and circumstantial testimony for the genuineness of the gospels of Matthew and Mark. Moreover, the fact that Papias does not quote the gospel of St John, which was very probably published at rather a late period in Ephesus, near Hierapolis, where Papias was bishop, is very easily accounted for; because it was the object of Papias in composing his five books, to take his materials not from written but from oral accounts; and because he had it not in his power to state anecdotes relative to the origin of this gospel, as he did of that of Matthew and Mark, since it had been but lately published in his country.[2] *Finally*, it is not probable that Papias intended our gospels by the written records, from which he did not anticipate as much profit as from the oral accounts of the contemporaries of the apostles. It is highly probable that St John, when he composed his gospel in Asia Minor, presupposed in his readers a knowledge of the other three evangelists Matthew, Mark and Luke; as is proved in the work "On the object of the gospel history of John" §§ 70. 71. These three gospels then must have circulated and have been known in Asia Minor; and consequently the object of Papias in the composition of his five books, could not have been to repeat those incidents and sayings of Jesus which had long been rendered familiar by those gospels. And hence, as his professed object was to collect accounts relative to Jesus which were not yet generally known, he had no occasion to inform us that he could make more use of oral accounts than of the written gospels, for the gospels contained no such accounts. But this remark of Papias is a favourable one, if the idea which he meant to convey was this: that he preferred obtaining his information personally from the contemporaries of

1 Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 39.

2 Vide the Dissertation of the author, in Flatt's Magazine sup. cit. &c. Vol. IV. p. 243 &c. Vol XI. p. 71. Schmidt's Introd. to New Test. Vol. I. p. 136 &c.

the apostles, who were yet living, rather than from Apocryphal gospels, whose authors were unknown and for whose statements he was not able to vouch.[1] But even admitting that by written records he actually meant our gospels, still his words would not express his disapprobation of them, but only assert that the oral accounts of the contemporaries of the apostles were more interesting to him individually and personally; and how perfectly natural is this in a person who was fond of anecdotes![2]

It appears therefore that the objections to the testimony of Irenaeus possess but little force, and that its validity remains unshaken.

5. *Theophilus*,[3] of Antioch, in the second century. He mentions John as the author of a gospel;[4] and he also composed a harmony of our four gospels, if we can credit the words of Jerome.[5] Theophilus (he says) Antiochenae ecclesiae septimus post Petrum apostolum Episcopus, qui quatuor Evangelistarum in unum opus dicta compingens ingenii sui monumenta nobis dimisit, etc. i. e. Theophilus, the seventh bishop of Antioch after the apostle Peter, has left us a specimen of his genius in his production, combining the contents of the four gospels into one work.

6. *Athenagoras* of the second century, ascribes both of the epistles to the Corinthians to an apostle, whom Hermias calls Paul, in his work against the heathen philosophers entitled *διασυρμος των εξω φιλοσοφων*, i. e. ridicule of the philosophers without the church. Athenagoras, de Resurrectione,[6] says, It is

---

1 Vide the Dissert. sup. cit. in Flatt's Magazine Vol. IV. p. 245, &c.

2 See the dissert. in Stäudlin's Beiträge, Vol V. p. 176, &c.

3 [Theophilus was the seventh bishop of Antioch after the apostle Peter, as Eusebius informs us, and was made bishop A. D. 168. His predecessors were Euodius, Ignatius, Heros, Cornelius and Eros; and his death occurred shortly after A. D. 181. S.]

4 L. II. ad. Antolycum.

5 Epist. ad Algasiam Quaest. 6.

6 page 61. edit. Coloniensis.

therefore clearly evident, *according to the declaration of the apostle, that this corruptible* and dissolvable *must put on incorruption*, in order that, being quickened by the resurrection of the dead, and the parts which were separated and scattered about every where being again united, *each one may justly receive the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad.*[1]

The words *το—αφθαρσιαν* and *ινα—κακα*, are taken, the former from 1 Cor. 15: 53, the latter from 2 Cor. 5: 10.

7. *Clemens of Alexandria*, in the second century makes very copious citations from all the homologoumena, excepting only the epistle to Philemon.

8. *Tertullian*, presbyter of Carthage, in the second century, attributes the historical books of the New Testament, the twelve epistles of Paul, (which Irenaeus also cites as productions of Paul,) the epistle to Philemon and the first epistle of Peter and first of John, to the same persons who are commonly regarded as their authors.

Tertullian, of Western Africa,[2] being the most ancient Latin writer that has reached us, is entitled to particular attention.[3] Among the important passages for the genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, are the following.

First; concerning the historical books of the New Testament, he says: "In the first place, I consider it as established, that the productions termed the Gospels, were written by the

---

[1] *ευδηλον παντι το λειπομενον, ὁτι δει κατα τον αποστολον, το φθαρτον τουτο και διασκεδαστον ενδυσασθαι αφθαρσιαν, ἱνα ζωοποιηθεντων ἐξ αναστασεως των νεκρωθεντων και παλιν ἑνωθεντων των κεχωρισμενων, ἡ και παντη διαλελυμενων ἑκαστος κομισηται διναιως, ἁ δια του σωματος επραξεν, ειτε αγαθα ειτε κακα.*

[2] Schmidt sup. cit. p. 26.

[3] Compare "Hänlein's Manual, being an Introd. to N. Test. Erlangen, 1794, part. I. p. 85—87.

apostles, to whom the Lord himself committed this charge of publishing the Gospel; but if companions of the apostles were also concerned in them, they nevertheless did not act alone, but in conjunction with the apostles, and following them as guides; because the publications of the disciples of the apostles might be exposed to the imputation of ambitious views, if the authority of their instructors, yea even that of Christ himself, which made their instructors apostles, did not support them. In a word we are taught the faith by the apostles *John* and *Matthew*, and it is confirmed to us by their disciples *Luke* and *Mark*."[1]

In Another passage he says: "In short, if it is evident that that is the more true which is the more ancient, and that the more ancient which is from the beginning, and that from the beginning which was derived from the apostles; then it will in like manner be evident, that what the apostolical churches held as inviolably sacred, they received from the apostles.—I assert therefore, that the Gospel of Luke, which I defend[2] to the utmost, was from its first publication, in possession of these (churches); and not only of the apostolical (churches) but also of all which are united with them in the bonds of a common faith.—The same authority of the apostolical churches supports also the other Gospels, which we have likewise received through them, and in the form in which they had them; namely the Gospels of *John* and of *Matthew:* and likewise that of Mark, which is ascribed to Peter, whose interpreter Mark was. And

---

[1] Constituimus in primis, evangelicum instrumentum Apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso Domino sit impositum; si et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis, et post apostolos; quoniam praedicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloriae studio, si non assistat illi autoritas magistrorum, imo Christi, quae magistros apostolos fecit. Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Johannes et Matthaeus insinuant, ex opostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant." Lib. IV. adv. Marcionem, c. 2.

[2] He defended the unadulterated Gospel of Luke against the spurious one of Marcion.

thus the digest of Luke is commonly ascribed to Paul; for it is customary to ascribe to the teachers, what their students published."[1]——The Acts of the Apostles is quoted by Tertullian under the title of Acta Apostolorum,[2] and Commentarius Lucae.[3]

Eckermann, who quotes [4] this testimony of Tertullian for the genuineness of our Gospels, makes an attempt to invalidate its force. He says:[5] "Before such an appeal to the testimony of the apostolical church can possess any weight, it is necessary that it should be specifically stated, that according to the tradition preserved in some particular church, Luke did, at a specified time, deliver the Gospel into the hands of that church; or that some friend of Luke, seeing the Gospel and the Acts of the apostles in the hands of Luke, heard him declare, with his own lips, that he actually wrote them," &c. But the principal ground on which Tertullian builds all that he says, is this: "The testimony of the church must be regarded as infallible; and she has decided in favour of the four Gospels. The truth of the traditionary opinion of the apostolic churches is based upon the fact that the apostles were their first teachers; as though it would follow that after the lapse of 150 years, every thing in them were still apostolic."[6]

In opposition to this, the author of "Reflections on the origin of the Gospels and Acts of the apostles"[6] remarks, that Tertullian

---

1 In summa, si constat, id verius, quod prius, id prius, quod et ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apostolis, pariter utique constabit, id esse ab apostolis traditum, quod apud Ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum.—Dico itaque apud illas (ecclesias), nec solum jam apostolicas, sed apud universas, quae illis de societate sacramenti confoederantur, id evangelium Lucae ab initio editionis suae stare, quod cum maxime tuemur. Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum Apostolicarum caeteris quoque patrocinabitur evangeliis, quae proinda per illas et secundum illas habemus, *Johannis* dico et *Matthaei*: licet et Marcus quod edidit, Petri affirmatur, cujus interpres Marcus. Nam et Lucae digestum Paulo adscribere solent; capit magistrorum videri quae discipuli promulgarint." Lib. IV. adv. Marcion. c. 5.

2 Adv. Marc. V. 1. 3 De Jejunio c. 10. 4 Sup. cit. 202—205.

5 Sup. cit. 204 &c. 6 Stäudlin's Beyträgen, Vol. V. p. 192 &c.

appeals, not to the doctrinal, but the historical tradition of the churches, which the apostles founded, and to which they committed their writings. This the whole connexion shows. In this very context, he says: "We have also the support of the churches of John; for although Marcion rejected the Revelation of John, the whole succession of bishops from the beginning, will testify that John was the author."[1] In order to prove that the Marcionite Gospel of Luke is spurious, he remarks in the same passage: "But Marcion's (Gospel of Luke) is unknown to most persons; and it is known to none, but as originating with him."[2] Of the other Gospels he says: "We have received them from the apostolical churches, and have precisely their text of them."[3] It appears therefore that there is nothing said relative to a *decision* of the apostolical churches in favour of the Gospels; but of the transmission of those writings, which they originally received as the productions of the apostles, unaltered, to other churches. The passage of Tertullian cited below[4] may also be consulted as proof that he refers to historical tradition.[5] But Eckermann has himself retracted the above-mentioned objections against the force of the tradition of the church, in the preface to his work entitled "Explanation of all the obscure passages of the New Testament."[6] He says: "The fact can admit of no dispute, that in the churches founded by the apostles, it could be known, which reputed writings of an apostle were genuine and which were spurious. And it is a remarkable fact,

[1] Habemus et Johannis ecclesias alumnas. Nam etsi Apocalypsim ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus in Johannem stabit autorem.

[2] Marcionis vero (Evangelium Lucae) plerisque nec notum; nullis notum, ut non eodem natum.

[3] Habemus per ecclesias apostolicas, et secundum illas.

[4] De praescript. haereticorum, c. 36.

[5] Compare Flatt's Magazine, Vol. IX. p. 31—33.

[6] Vol. I. p. VII.

which places the integrity of the witnesses for the genuineness of our canonical Gospels in the clearest light, that there have been transmitted to us but two Gospels composed by apostles, and two others composed by disciples of apostles. Had the names under which they were submitted to the world, been fictitious, why were not all the Gospels ascribed to apostles, rather than to persons who had only been their scholars?"

One other objection raised against the validity of historical tradition as supporting the homologoumena, is this: that in the earliest times, tradition supported as genuine and apostolical some books which were afterwards proved to be supposititious; and therefore it can possess no weight in the balance of historical investigation. A reply to this objection the reader will find in Flatt's Magazine.[1]

Secondly, as to the Epistles of Paul. The two epistles to the Corinthians, the two to the Thessalonians, the first to Timothy, and those to the Galatians, the Romans, Ephesians and the Colossians, are quoted, by Tertullian, De pudicitia, c. 13—19. The second epistle to Timothy is cited, in Scorpiacum contra Gnosticos, c. 13. The epistle to Titus, in Praescriptiones haereticorum, c. 6. And that to the Philippians, in the fifth book against Marcion, c. 20. And throughout the whole of this fifth book, the epistles of Paul are frequently quoted.

The same book, c. 21. contains a remark relative to an epistle, which, though Philemon is not named in the text, could have been no other than that addressed to him. "This epistle alone was shielded by its brevity from the falsifying hands of Marcion. Yet it is strange, *as Marcion received this epistle to an individual*, that he should reject the two to Timothy and the one to Titus."[2]

1 Stück IX. s. 2—47.

2 Soli huic epistolae brevitas sua profuit ut falsarias manas Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen, cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit (Marcion,) quod ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum, recusaverit.

The first epistle of Peter is cited, in Scorpiac. c. 12. 14. and the first epistle of John, de pudicitia, c. 19. In addition to these passages, we will insert that above mentioned, contained in his Præscript. Hæreticorum, c. 36. "Pass through all the apostolical churches, in which the seats of the apostles are still filled, and in which their genuine [1] epistles are publicly read, by which their voice continues to sound, and their countenances are still exhibited. Is Achaia nearest to you? Corinth is not distant. If you are but little removed from Macedonia, Philippi is there. If you can go to Asia, you have there Ephesus. But if you adjoin Italy, Rome is at hand."[2]

Fragments of Caius, who lived in the beginning of the third century. According to Eusebius,[3] Caius, attributed thirteen epistles to Paul; whom he terms (*ἱερον αποστολον*) the holy apostle.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

The internal evidence is wholly in favour of the genuineness of the books of the New Testament:—they contain nothing incongruous with the age or other circumstances in which they were written.

Michaelis has clearly shown, that the style of the books of

---

1 *Schmidt* (Introd. N. Test. II. 30.) doubts whether the autographs of the apostolical epistles be meant here. *Hug*, (Introd. I. 93) thinks the phrase "literae authenticae" signifies *genuine unadulterated epistles;* and appeals, in support of this signification of the word *authenticus*, to the passage de monogamia, c. 11. [The learned Dr. Lardner (Works, v. II. p. 167—8. ed. 8vo.) expresses his opinion thus: "Tertullian, by 'authentic letters,' does not mean the original epistles. Nor does he mean letters in their original language. But by *authentic*, he seems to mean *certain, well attested;* the Greek word is so used by Cicero: and by *authenticae literae* we are not to understand authentic letters or epistles, but '*scriptures;*' so the word ought in my opinion to be rendered." And in support of each of these propositions, he as usual adduces his reasons. S.]

2 "Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsae adhuc cathedrae apostolorum suis locis praesidentur, apud quas authenticae literae eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, repraesentantes faciem. Proxima est tibi Achaia: habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiae adjiceris, habes Romam.

3 Hist. Eccl. VI. 30.

the New Testament is an internal proof of their genuineness ;[1] and he has proved, that the historical data of the New Testament accord, even in the most minute circumstances, with the history of the time in which they were said to be written.[2] He has likewise answered several objections, derived from the actual or apparent contradictions between other historians, especially Josephus, and the narratives of the New Testament. Compare on this subject, the very complete enumeration of the internal evidences for the genuineness of the New Testament writings, in Hänlein's Introduction to the New Testament,[3] and in Kleuker's "Full investigation of the evidences for the genuineness and credibility of the original records of christianity."[4] These internal evidences for the genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, are compressed into a narrow space, in Griesinger's Introduction to the books of the New Covenant;[5] and select remarks on this subject, may be found in Hug's Introduction.[6]

The Gospels of *Matthew* and *Mark*, like the other Gospels, contain nothing which can be regarded even as an inferential, negative proof of their spuriousness. Eckermann, in his "Theologische Beiträge"[7] has, indeed, attempted to prove the Gospels and Acts not genuine, by internal evidence. But his arguments are refuted, in the "Reflections on the origin of the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles ;"[8] and in the Dissertation of Storr, on the question : "Did Jesus represent his miracles to be a proof of the divinity of his mission ?"[9]

1 Introduction to N. Test. § 4. 10. 11. 12.

2 See also Hug's Introduction to the N. Test. p. 8—25.

3 Pt. I. § 3—6. p. 41—70. 4 Vol. I. and vol. III. pt. I. p. 32—104.

5 p. 7. 8. Stuttgard, 1799. 6 Pt. I. § 3—5.

7 Pt. II. in the two Dissertations : "Did Jesus consider signs and miracles as proofs of the divinity of his mission ?"—and, "On the sure grounds of belief in the principal facts of the history of Jesus, and on the probable origin of the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles."

8 Stäudlins Beiträge, vol. V. p. 156—163.

9 Flatt's Mag. pt. IV. p. 234 &c.

The principal objections of Eckermann, together with the answers to them contained in these dissertations, are the following :

Objection 1. The illiterate disciples of Jesus could not well have possessed any skill in writing. Matthew alone, having been a publican, may have been an exception.

Reply. We have no authority for asserting that the disciples of Jesus were wholly unable to write; although their artless narratives may prove that they were not acquainted with the artificial rules of composition."[1] Again; they may, like Paul, have dictated their works to others, who served as their amanuenses.[2] Moreover, Eckermann is inconsistent with himself; for he admits that the groundwork of the Gospels of Matthew, Luke and John, like that of the Acts of the Apostles, was the composition of those very men; though he supposes they were re-written at a subsequent period, and much enlarged by spurious additions.[3]

Objection 2. Prior to the commencement of the second century, there was no necessity for written records of the life and doctrines of Jesus.

Reply. The inference of the non-existence of a thing from the fact of its being unnecessary is, in general, not legitimate.[4] But the contrary fact has been proved by Griesinger, in his Introduction to the New Testament, p. 99, and by Eichhorn, in his Introduction to the New Testament, vol. I. p. 3. who state the causes why such a written record was necessary. Again; must the apostles be supposed to have provided only for cases of absolute and indispensable necessity? May there not have been many christians, who were desirous of possessing circumstantial narratives of the life of Jesus? The opponents of christianity,

1 Stäudlin's Beiträge, sup. cit. p. 156 &c.

2 Flatt's Mag. sup. cit. p. 250. Stäudlin's Beiträge, p. 157.

3 Stäudlin's Beit. sup. cit. Flatt's Mag. p. 249.

4 Stäudlin's Beiträge, p. 157.

even in the apostolical age, may have rendered it necessary, on many accounts, to commit to paper the history and doctrines of Jesus.

Objection 3. It is evident from the whole tenor of both dissertations of Eckermann, that the principal ground on which he builds his hypothesis of the spuriousness of the historical books of the New Testament, is this: The Gospels are not written in the spirit of Jesus and his immediate disciples; for Jesus and his disciples would not, by any means, have belief in their doctrines founded on signs and miracles. Now as there are passages in the Gospels, in which signs and miracles are presented as proofs of the divine mission of Jesus, e. g. Matt. 11: 20—24. 2—6. Mark 16: 11, 18. Luke 10: 13, &c. John 2: 11, 23. 6: 26; we must believe that all such passages, and indeed, whatever is either itself miraculous, or is confirmed solely by miracles, are the additions of later christians, who altered and corrupted the publications of Matthew, Luke and John, about the end of the first century.

Reply. Without recurring to either the internal or external proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels, the principal facts in the life of Jesus (the truth of which Eckermann admits) would themselves lead us to conclude, a priori, not only that Jesus himself believed in the extraordinary agency of God, but that he would refer his hearers to miracles and signs as proofs of his divine mission. Consult "Philosophical and historico-exegetical Remarks on the Miracles," in Flatt's Magazine, pt. III. § 35—38. Moreover, the assumption that Jesus and his apostles would not have a belief in the doctrines of Jesus to be founded at all on miracles, is false: nor does a single one of the passages which Eckermann adduces, afford the least ground for such an assertion. Compare the dissertation "Did Jesus declare his miracles to be a proof of the divinity of his mission?" in Flatt's Mag. pt. IV. § 3—5.

Again, if every thing miraculous in the history and doctrines of Jesus contained in our Gospels, originated with superstitious christians, who first appeared about the close of the first century; how comes it that our Gospels obtained such a general reception throughout the christian church? Or if it was a universal mania for miracles, which produced this effect; how comes it that some churches at least did not prefer one or other of the apocryphal books, in which the biography of Jesus is still more replete with miracles? And if the much older fact, that Matthew, Luke and John left certain books behind them, was known till after the middle of the second century; how happens it that the far more recent fact, of the revision and enlargement of them, was at the same time unknown? And why was not the least reference made to it, when our Gospels were universally received as canonical?[1]

Objection 4. If Matthew had himself written the Gospel which bears his name, he would certainly have given us more of those excellent and instructive discourses of Jesus, which are now found only in Luke and John.

Reply. It was inconsistent with the object of Matthew, to insert into his Gospel those things which he omitted and which are found in the other Gospels. See this proved in the work "On the Object of the evangelical history of John," § 62, 64, and in Stäudlin's Beiträge, p. 166.

For a literary view of the late works and dissertations, in which the genuineness of the Gospel of John has been either disputed or proved, by internal and external evidence, consult Wegscheider's Complete Introduction to the Gospel of John, Göttingen, 1806. p. 78, &c. and Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Test. Vol. II. p. 239. ed. 1810. The latter work contains likewise a refutation of the latest objections, as advanced by Clu-

[1] Vide the Dissertation quoted, in Flatt's Mag. 4. p. 237—239.

dius in his "Uransichten des Christenthum's," p. 50—89, Altonae, 1808.

The Gospels of Matthew and Mark contain clear internal evidence, from which the positive inference may be made, that the former was written by Matthew, and the latter by a disciple of Peter. The internal mark in the Gospel of Matthew, which supports the opinion that Matthew is the author, is the narrative which he gives of his own call to the apostolic office, chapter ix. 9—13. This subject is discussed in the work "On the Object of St. John," p. 355 and 303. In the latter passage, it is remarked that the insertion of a circumstantial account of the reception of Matthew into the number of the twelve, and of other circumstances connected with it, in a Gospel which touches so seldom on the earlier history of the other Apostles, is best accounted for by the fact, that Matthew himself is the author of this Gospel.

Several internal marks, which prove that the author of the Gospel of Mark was a disciple of the apostle Peter, are stated in Dissert. I. in Libror. N. T. Historicorum aliquot loca, (Opusc. Academica, Vol. III. p. 10.) and in the works there mentioned. Thus, notice is taken, p. 60 &c. of the fact, that Peter is distinguished in the 16th verse of Mark III, by a deviation from the particular construction of the sentence which was commenced in v. 14, and afterwards continued from v. 17 to 19:—that although his name is not mentioned out of its proper place, still he is not mentioned expressly as the first :—the circumstance that, in Mark 8: 29, merely the confession of Peter is mentioned, and the answer of Jesus (Matt. 16: 17—19.) which reflects such honour on Peter, omitted :—the fact that Mark, in imitation of Peter, (Acts 1: 21,) begins his account with the baptism of John :—and p. 64, note 107, it is observed, that Mark only (chap. 8: 22—26.) gives the history of the blind man of

Bethsaida, the birth place of Peter, (John 1: 45.) which may on that account, have been more interesting to him. Compare Hug's Introduction to the New Testament, pt. II. § 27. p. 90 &c. where the passages Mark 1: 36. 5: 37. 13: 3. 16: 7, are considered with reference to this point.

The English divine, Dr Paley, in his Horae Paulinae, published in 1790, advances a new and pertinent argument for the genuineness of the thirteen epistles of Paul, and for the credibility of the Acts of the Apostles, founded on their reciprocal relations and references to each other, which were evidently the effect, not of premeditation and design, but of accidental coincidence.[1]

Objections have been made by late writers, drawn from internal circumstances ;

1. Against the genuineness of the 2d epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, in Schmidt's Introd. to N. Test. pt. I. § 112. note e. p. 256, &c. Compare in refutation, the remarks in Tübing. gel. Anzeigen, No. 26. p. 205, 1807.

2. Against the genuineness of the first epistle of Paul to Timothy, in Schleiermacher's " Critical Letters on the reputed first epistle of Paul to Timothy," Berlin, 1807. See a vindication of the genuineness of this epistle, against Schleiermacher's objections, in the Tübinger gelehrten Anzeigen," 1807, No. 54.—and Planck's "Remarks on the first epistle of Paul to Timothy, in reference to the Critical Letters of Prof. Fr. Schleiermacher," Göttingen, 1808. — and Hug's Introd. to N. Test. part II. § 102. p. 258—263.—and Wegscheider's " Pastoral letters of the apostle Paul," part I. Göttingen, 1810, p. 9, &c.

3. Against the integrity of the first epistle of Peter, in Cludius " Uransichten des Christenthums," p. 296—303. Al-

1-This work was translated into German by Henke, Helmstädt, 1797.

tonae, 1808. Compare in refutation, the Programma of Augusti, entitled: Nova, quâ primae Petri epistolae authentia impugnatur, hypothesis sub examen vocatur. Jenae, 1808.

4. Against the genuineness of the first epistle of John, in Lange's "Writings of John," part. III. Weimar, 1797, p. 4—13, where the writer confesses, that these doubts can have no weight, when compared with the unanimous testimony of antiquity. Compare in reply, what is said in Eichhorn's Introd. Vol. II. p. 281, on the internal evidences of the genuineness of this epistle.

Supplementary note.—*On the origin and reciprocal relation of the first three Gospels.*

Consult the work "On the Object of the Gospel of John," § 2, p. 235 &c. "Dissert. I. in librorum N. T. historicorum aliquot locos" (Opusc. Acad. Vol. I. p. 62 &c.) and the "Programma de fonte Evangeliorum Matthaei et Lucae," 1794. On the history and literature of the different views concerning the origin and reciprocal relation of the first three Gospels, see Hänlein's Introd. to N. Test. Vol. II. pt. 2. Griesinger's Introd. to N. T. p. 19, 35; Herbert Marsh's Dissertation on the origin and composition of the three first canonical Gospels, in the second part of the notes and additions to Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament, translated into German by Ernst Frederick Charles Rosenmüller, Göttingen, 1803, p. 137—331; and Vogel on the origin of the first three gospels, in Gabler's "Journal for select theological Literature," Vol. I. pt. I. p. 1—65, 1804.

The principal opinions in regard to the relation of the first three Gospels, which have of late been advocated, are the following:

I. That the three evangelists copied from one another. The opinions are, that either,

Matthew wrote first; and Mark, when composing his Gospel, had Matthew's before him; and Luke had Matthew's and

Mark's. See Hug's Introd. to N. Test. Vol. II. p. 51—133. Or:

Mark formed his Gospel wholly from the two others. See Griesbach's "Commentatio, quâ Marci evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae Commentariis decerptum esse monstratur." P. I, II, Jenae, 1789, 90, printed in Commentt. Theolog. Ed. Velthusen, Kuinöl, Vol. I. Paulus' Commentary on the first three Gospels, and Introductionis in N. T. Capita Selectiora, Jenae, 1799. No. IV. In the latter dissertation, the writer supposes that Matthew and Luke in the composition of their Gospels, had used detached and scattered Greek accounts of the life of Jesus, and that the same were used in part by both. Or:

Mark wrote his gospel first; and Matthew and Luke made use of it. This opinion is stated in some of the writings above referred to. The similarity between Luke and our Greek Matthew is accounted for by the supposition, that the Greek translator of Matthew made some use of Luke. See "On the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 360. Or:

Luke wrote first; and Mark availed himself of Luke's Gospel; and Matthew of both the others. See Vogel. sup. cit. p. 34, &c.

II. The Evangelists derived their Gospels from one or more common sources, Aramaean or Greek; such as an original Gospel, or different editions and translations of it. Several more recent modifications of this hypothesis, (which refer to the number or nature or language of these sources, and to the use made of them by the evangelists,) are found in the following works;

In Hänlein's Introduction to N. Test. sup. cit. p. 270, &c.

In Marsh's Dissertation on the origin and Composition of the first three Gospels, p. 284, &c. of Rosenmüller's translation.[1]

[1] And in the original English work, Bishop Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. III. part. 2. p. 361, &c.

In Eichhorn's Introd. to N. Test. Vol. I. 1804. See also the Reviews of this Introduction, in the "Tübinger gelehrten Anzeigen," for 1805, Nos. 18—20. p. 137—156. and in the "Haller. Lit. zeitung," for 1805, No. 127, &c. See also Hug's Introd. part. I. p. 63, &c.

In Schmidt's Introd. to N. Test. part. I. § 37—43. Several critical remarks on the views which have been entertained of the relation of our Gospels, are contained in § 24—43.

In Gratz's "New attempt to explain the origin of the first three Gospels," Tübingen, 1812.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

The testimony of the earliest heretics to the genuineness of the homologoumena.

The genuineness of the homologoumena was acknowledged, even by those heretics of the earliest ages to whose interest the authority of these books was extremely prejudicial; for they sought refuge in arbitrary interpretations of the odious passages; and did not presume to dispute the genuineness of the books. Among the Gnostics, for instance, there were some sects who admitted the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, but distorted their meaning by their explanations, and maintained the necessity of giving an allegorical turn to all the declarations of the apostles. Irenaeus says: "So great is the certainty in regard to our Gospels, that even the heretics themselves bear testimony in their favour; and all acknowledging them, each endeavours to establish from them his own opinion."[1] He adds: "But all the others, (except the aforementioned Marcionites,) being puffed up by science falsely so called, do indeed acknowledge the genuineness of the Scriptures, but pervert them by their interpretations."[2] They moreover accused the

1 "Tanta est circa Evangelia hæc firmitas, ut et ipsi haeretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam." Irenaeus, Lib. III. c. 11. § 7.

2 Reliqui vero omnes, falso scientiæ nomine inflati, Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt. Ibid. c. 12. § 12.—Compare Schmidt's observations upon the Commentary of the Gnostic Heracleon on the Gospel of John; in his Introd. to N. T. part I. p. 238.

writers of the New Testament of accommodation, when they were pressed by individual passages. "These lying sophists assert, (says Irenaeus,) that the apostles hypocritically dispensed their instruction according to the capacity of their audience, accommodating their answers to the prejudices of the inquirers; teaching the illiterate such things as would gratify their ignorance, fostering the indolence of the lazy, and cherishing the errors of the deluded;—and to those able to comprehend the ineffable Father, they explained the deep mysteries of religion by parabolic and figurative representations: so that our Lord and his apostles did not (according to their views) teach truth as it is, but hypocritically and in accommodation to the dispositions of men."[1]—And in chap. 12. § 6, where Irenaeus utters similar sentiments relative to this Gnostic theory of accommodation, he makes the following impressive remark: "Superfluous and in vain would the advent of our Lord appear, if he came to tolerate and cherish the former erroneous opinions of men respecting God."[2] The Valentinians, one of the Gnostic sects, were particularly attached to the Gospel of John.[3] But it appears they had also our other Gospels, and particularly that of Luke, or at least an abridged and perhaps an

1 "Dicunt hi, qui vanissimi sunt Sophistæ, quod apostoli cum hypocrisi fecerunt doctrinam secundum audientium capacitatem, et responsiones secundum interrogantium suspiciones, cœcis cœca confabulantes secundum cœcitatem ipsorum; languentibus autem secundum lauguorem ipsorum, et errantibus secundum errorem eorum;—his vero, qui innominabilem Patrem capiunt, per parabolas et ænigmata inenarrabile fecisse mysterium: itaque non, quemadmodum ipsa habet veritas, sed in hypocrisi, et quemadmodum capiebat unusquisque, Dominum et Apostolos edidisse magisterium." Iren. L. III. c. 5. § 1.

2 "Superfluus autem et inutilis adventus Domini apparebit, si quidem venit permissurus et servaturus uniuscujusque olim insitam de Deo opinionem.—See also Carus: Historia antiquior Sententiarum Ecclesiae Græcæ de Accommodatione Christo imprimis et Apostolis tributa," Lipsiae, 1793, § 16.

3 Irenæus says: "Hi autem qui a Valentino sunt, eo, quod est secundum Johannem, (evangelio) plenissine utentes, &c. L. III. c. 7. § 11. In the work "On the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 52, it is remarked, that the Valentinians probably derived many forms of expression from the Gospel of John, which were unknown to the elder Gnostics.

adulterated copy; as we learn from Origen and Irenaeus. The latter, (after having adduced several parts of the history and doctrines of Jesus, which are contained only in Luke,) says: "And many other things which are found in Luke alone, are made use of by both Marcion and Valentinus:"[1]— "and consequently, they must either adopt the other contents of Luke, or reject these also."[2] And Origen, in reply to the objection of his opponent, "that some of the christians altered the Gospel in three or four different ways, in order to evade objections;" makes these remarks: "I know of none who adulterated the Gospel except the followers of Marcion, and of Valentinus, and as I suppose those of Lucian."[3] It likewise appears, that to the original number of the gospels, they added another, termed "the Gospel of truth:" for, otherwise they could not have boasted of having more Gospels than the catholic church; as Irenaeus informs us they did: "The followers of Valentinus produce their own writings; and boast of the possession of *more* Gospels than really exist. Nay to such a pitch has their audacity risen, that to a production of their own, which has no resemblance to the apostolical Gospels, they have given the name of The Gospel of truth."[4] And it seems that Valentinus, like Marcion, received the writings of Paul; from which

---

[1] Et alia multa sunt, quae inveniri possunt a solo Luca dicta esse, quibus et Marcion et Valentinus utuntur. Lib. III. c. 14. § 3.

[2] "Necesse est igitur, et reliqua quae ab eo (Luca) dicta sunt, recipere eos, aut et his renuntiare. Ibid. § 4. And at the end of this section, after having again spoken of the Valentinians and the Marcionites and especially of the former, he adds: Si autem et reliqua suscipere cogentur, intendentes perfecto evangelio et apostolorum doctrinæ, opportet eos poenitentiam agere.

[3] *μεταχαραξαντας δε το ευαγγέλιον αλλους ουκ οιδα, η τους απο Μαρκιωνος, και τους απο Ουαλεντινου, οιμαι δε και τους απο Λουκανου*, Contra Celsum L. II. § 27.

[4] Hi vero qui a Valentino sunt, suas conscriptiones proferentes, plura habere gloriantur quam sint ipsa evangelia. Si quidem in tantum processerunt audauciae, ut, quod ab his non olim conscriptum est, veritatis evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens Apostolorum evangeliis.

the Gnostics are said to have taken proofs in support of their system.[1] For Irenaeus distinguishes Valentinus and Marcion, from another sect who rejected the writings of the apostle Paul.[2] Tertullian says,[3] that Valentinus appears to have used the whole collection of New Testament books; and to have spared those which Marcion had lacerated. His only complaint is, that Valentinus perverted their meaning.[4]

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The genuineness of the homologoumena acknowledged by the earlier heretics.

The earlier heretics made alterations and erasions in the homologoumena; but acknowledged the genuineness of these books. This is exemplified in the case of Marcion, a very ancient witness, who decidedly maintained that ten of Paul's epistles were genuine; but asserted that alterations and interpolations had been made in them, by some christians who were inclined towards Judaism. Accordingly, he undertook the task of restoring them to their primitive form; and actually published what he regarded as an improved edition of them.[5] He believed the Gospel of Luke to have been written, not by Luke, but by the apostle Paul: and this too he undertook to improve. Now the very fact, that Marcion regarded the Gospel of Luke, which he used, as a production of Paul; evinces the existence of an earlier opinion, that Luke was the author of this Gospel. And this opinion it was, in connexion with the passage, Coloss. 4: 14. where Paul mentions the salutation of "Luke the beloved phy-

1 Irenaeus, L. III. c. 2. § 1. and c. 7. § 1, remarks that the Gnostics appealed to both passages of Paul, 1 Cor. 2: 4. and 2 Cor. 4: 4.

2 Advers. Haeres. L.III. c.14. § 3,4. and c.15. § 1. Eadem autem dicimus iterum et his, qui Paulum apostolum non cognoscunt &c.

3 De præscriptionibus, c. 38.

4 See Hug's Introduction, pt. I. p. 72, &c.

5 Semleri Historiae Ecclesiasticae Capita Selecta, T. I. p. 17. 43. On the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 256—260.—Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. LI. Tübinger gel. Anzeigen, p.175 &c. 1795.

sician," together with other similar statements, which gave rise to the thought that the Gospel of Luke was alluded to by Paul, when he speaks of *his* Gospel, Gal. 2: 5, 7, 14, and in other passages. The unfounded opinion, that Paul participated in the composition of the Gospel of Luke, arose[1] from a misapprehension of the meaning of *ευαγγελιον* in the words of Paul, (Rom. 2: 16. and 16: 25.) *κατα το ευαγγελιον μου*, i. e. according to my Gospel; for it was customary, early, to appropriate the word *ευαγγελιον* to biographies of Christ. Hence it was inferred, that Paul must have left a biography of Christ; and as there was none extant under his name, and as it was evident from the Acts of the apostles, (16: 20 &c.) and from the epistles of Paul, (Col. 4: 14. 2 Tim. 4: 11.) that Luke was his confident; the Gospel of Luke was therefore termed Paul's Gospel. Accordingly, Eusebius remarks: "It is said, that Paul referred to the Gospel of Luke, when he used the expression, 'according to my Gospel,' as if he were writing concerning a Gospel of his own."[2] In addition to this, it was a customary saying, that Mark's Gospel sprung from the sermons of Peter, and Luke's Gospel from those of Paul.[3] Thus Irenaeus says: "Mark himself, who was the scholar and interpreter of Peter, transmitted to us in writing what Peter announced. And Luke, the follower of Paul, recorded the Gospel which Paul preached."[4] Such observations would not have become current, had it not been well known that Gospels were extant bearing the names of Mark and Luke.

---

1 See "On the object of John," § 54, 56.

2 *φασι δε, ὡς αρα του κατα Λουκαν ευαγγελιου μνημονευειν ὁ Παυλος ειωθεν, ὁπηνικα ὡς περι ιδιου τινος ευαγγελιου γραφων ελεγε· κατα το ευαγγελιον μου*, Hist. Eccl. III. 4.

3 Compare Schmidt's Introd. pt. I. p. 50.

4 Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, et ipse quæ a Petro annuntiata erant per scripta (*εγγραφως*) nobis tradidit. Et Lucas sectator Pauli, quod ab illo prædicabatur evangelium in libro condidit. Adv. Haereses, L. III. c. 1. § 1.

Supplementary note.

On the Gospel of Marcion, and the different hypotheses concerning it.

The various and opposite hypotheses concerning the Gospel of Marcion are the following :[1]

First, the Gospel of Marcion differed[2] from our Gospel of Luke, but was related to it in its origin.

Löffler expresses his opinion thus : "The Gospel of Marcion was probably not an adulterated copy of Luke's Gospel, but a distinct one; which, in some sections coincided with Luke even verbatim, but in others, was so different from it, especially in the arrangement and selection of its narratives, that although they were distinct Gospels, both were derived from the same primitive source." See his "Dissertatio : Marcionem Pauli epistolas et Lucæ evangelium adulterasse dubitatur," 1788, inserted in the Commentt. Theol. edit. a Velthusen, Kuinöl, et Ruperti, Vol. 1. No. 6.

J. E. C. Schmidt, in his Manual of christian ecclesiastical History, Vol. 1. p. 263 &c. ed. 1801, observes : "The Gospel of Marcion appears to have been a distinct Gospel, which had no other relation to that of Luke, than that which the first three Gospels yet extant bear to each other."—And in his Introd. to N. Test. Vol. 1. p. 131, he says: "Marcion's Gospel may either have proceeded, principally, from the same sources from which that of Luke was derived; or it may itself have been one of those sources."

Eichhorn says, in his Introduction to N. Test. Vol. 1. p. 141. 76, "The Gospel of Marcion belongs to the same principal branch of the original trunk of our three canonical Gospels and

---

1 See the work, "On the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 255,—and § 4. Illust. 1. of this work.

2 Semler, in his Proleg. in Epist. ad Galatas, p. 16, says: Marcion apud suos tantum usus fuit Evangelio unico, quod non omnino conveniebat cum illis quatuor (evangeliis.)

of all the lost Gospels, to which the Gospel of Luke belongs.—The same Gospel, which fell into the hands of Marcion in a very unfinished state, appears to have been one of the sources of the Gospel of Luke, and to have served as its groundwork. And if the copy which reached Luke, was not more finished and comprehensive than Marcion's Gospel, it was Luke himself who gave it greater comprehensiveness and a better form; and with the aid of the other sources which he possessed, brought it to its present state." Compare Gabler's Journal for select Theolog. Literature, Vol. 3. No. 1. p. 67.

Feilmoser, in his Introduction to the books of the N. Test. p. 153. Inspruck, 1810, remarks: "Marcion used one of the imperfect narratives, which were extant before Luke wrote, (1: 1—4.): Luke also availed himself of the aid of the same document in the composition of his gospel."

Secondly, Marcion's Gospel was an abbreviated and revised copy of the Gospel of Luke.

It was a revised copy, which may have approximated nearer to the genuine original Gospel of Luke, than our canonical copy. See Corrodi's "Attempt to shed light on the Jewish and Christian Canon." pt. 2. p. 174.

The conjecture, that it was the genuine original Gospel of Luke, was advocated by J. E. C. Schmidt in his Dissertation on "The genuine Gospel of Luke."[1] He subsequently renounced the hypothesis; but it was again supported by Charles Christian Ludwig Schmidt, in the "Repertory for biblical Literature &c. part I. p. 58 &c. 1803. See, in refutation of this hypothesis, Süskind: Symbolarum ad illustranda quaedam evangeliorum loca, P. II. p. 3—37, 1803.

Marcion's Gospel and our Luke, may have been different revisions of the original Luke. Hänlein, in his "Manual Intro-

[1] Henke's Magazine for Religious Philosophy and Exegesis. Vol. 5. pt. 3. p. 468—520, 1796.

duction to the New Testament,"[1] expresses himself in the following terms: "Marcion's Gospel must have been an ancient, abbreviated recension—probably one in use before his time, in his native country—of that text, which somewhat altered and more full, was in possession of the Catholic Church, under the name of Luke's Gospel. Perhaps Luke was himself the author of two editions of his Gospel; the first more concise, which he used as a text-book in his public discourses on the history of christianity; the other more prolix, which he delivered to Theophilus, or to a number of hellenistic readers, in order to satisfy their desire of possessing a historical work, which should embrace the oral as well as written evangelical traditions. In this case, if the first of these copies was delivered by Luke to some layman or small church, in the northeastern provinces of Asia Minor; and fell into the hands of different parties, before the other apostolical Gospels appeared; and was circulated among them anonymously, yet under the authority of the apostle Paul; and several years afterwards, the second and more full copy was introduced into the larger catholic churches from Achaia, Antiochia, Cæsaræa or Alexandria; these circumstances would account, satisfactorily, for the difference between the copies, and for the attachment of each party, orthodox and heretical, to its own recension; and also for the reciprocal charges of corrupting the Gospel, without supposing either party guilty of intentional and actual falsification of their copy. The diverse accounts of Theophilus' place of residence, and of the place where Luke's Gospel was composed, and whence it was first promulgated, afford some countenance to the supposition of a duplicate recension."

Thirdly, Marcion's Gospel was a compilation, made up of extracts from the other evangelists, and especially from Luke.

[1] Part 2. p. 376 &c. Erlangen, 1800.

See Griesbach's Historia textus græc. epistolarum Paulinarum, Spec. I. Sect. III. § 8. p. 92. Paulus, in his "Supplements to the Commentary on the Gospels," p. 36. Lubeck, 1808, remarks: "It is evident from Tertullian, (adv. Marcion,) that Marcion formed an abstract of the Gospels and epistles, in which he (wisely) omitted every thing that was to be explained only by a reference to Jewish customs, or that harmonized with the former prevalent views, in order that such things might not be publicly read to his anti-Judaizing people."

Fourthly, Schelling, in his Dissert. de Marcione Paullinarum epistolarum Emendatore, (Tübingen 1795,) attempts to make it appear probable, that the Fathers, Irenaeus, Tertullian and Epiphanus, never saw Marcion's copy; and that Tertullian in particular, set down as Marcion's falsifications, all the apparently suspicious readings and glosses which he found in his own copy; and in some places, merely conjectured what Marcion must have omitted in order to support his system." Compare the objections to this hypothesis, in the "Tübinger gel. Anzeigen," No. 60. 1795.

Fifthly, Bolten in his "Translation of Luke's account of Jesus the Messiah, with notes," 1796, Preface, § 8—11, considers the deviations of Marcion's Gospel of Luke from the commonly received copy, as deducible from the following three sources: 1. Many of them are slight variations, such as occur in other MSS. and in the translations and citations of the Fathers. 2. Several accounts contained in our Luke, were omitted by Marcion and his followers, either because they regarded them as the spurious additions of another hand, or because, not believing the divine origin of Luke's Gospel, they thought they had a right to subject his accounts to the ordeal of their criticism. 3. The doctrinal views of Marcion affected in some

measure certain passages, because he doubted the divine origin and the infallibility of Luke.

The following are the principal arguments, adduced in the works above cited, to vindicate Marcion from the charge of adulterating the epistles of Paul, and especially the Gospel of Luke:

1. The accusation of his having adulterated the New Testament, advanced by the Fathers of the church, originated partly from want of information, and partly from suspicion and injustice towards the heretics.

2. Nearly all the alterations, which the Fathers and particularly Tertullian cite from the canon of Marcion, are of such a kind, as Marcion would not have made with a view to favour his doctrinal peculiarities. And, from the well known penetration of Marcion, it would be unaccountable, if he really undertook to model the Gospel of Luke into accordance with his own views, why he suffered so many passages, which are unfavourable to them, to remain.

3. The Gospels of Mark and John might, with much less alteration, have been made to favour his Gnostic philosophy, more directly, than the Gospel of Luke.

4. Marcion's Gospel had not the name of its author prefixed to it, as Tertullian himself informs us.[1] And the Fathers only inferred, from the similarity of Marcion's Gospel to that of Luke, that the former was an adulteration of the latter. Tertullian expresses himself thus: "Marcion appears to have selected Luke from among our evangelists to be lacerated."[2] "He endeavoured to represent as corrupt the genuine Gospels, which were published with the names of the apostles or their

[1] L. IV. contra Marcionem, c. 2. "Marcion Evangelio suo nullum adscribit autorem."

[2] Ex his commentatoribus, quos habemus, Lucam videtur Marcion elegisse, quam caederet, Lib. IV. cont. Marc. c. 2.

scholars, (Mark and Luke,) that he might transfer to his own Gospel that authority which he wrested from them."[1] In like manner Irenaeus says: "Marcion, rejecting the whole Gospel, still glories in having a Gospel:"[2] i. e. he sets his Gospel in opposition to the four Gospels of the Catholic Church.

In reply to these hypotheses and objections,

The following arguments are advanced, in the writings of the author of this work, in the Review of Schelling's dissertation contained in the Tüb. gel. Anzeigen, No. 60, for 1795, in Süskind's Symbb. ad illustranda quaedam evangeliorum loca. P. II. p. 3 etc. in Hug's Introd. to N. Test. part I. p. 64—66. and in Arneth's tract, "On Marcion's acquaintance with our New Testament canon, and on his Gospel in particular," Lintz, 1809.

Reply to obj. 1. Both Irenaeus and Tertullian confidently assert, that some things were omitted in the copy of Marcion. The former says: "Marcion and his followers, have undertaken to mutilate the Scriptures; some books indeed they rejected entirely, but the Gospel of Luke and the epistles of Paul they mutilated, and then pronounced what themselves had spared to be genuine."[3] And again: "Marcion gave his followers a fragment of the Gospel. And he cut to pieces the epistles of the apostle Paul in the same manner," &c.[4] And: "Cur-

1 "Connititur ad destruendum statum eorum evangeliorum, quæ propria et sub Apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam Apostolicorum, ut scilicet fidem quam illis adimit, suo conferat." Ibid. c. 3.

2 Marcion, totum rejiciens evangelium, pariter gloriatur se habere evangelium. Advers. Hæreses, III. c. 11. § 9.

3 Marcion, et qui ab eo sunt, ad intercidendas conversi sunt scripturas, quasdam quidem in totum non cognoscentes, secundum Lucam autem evangelium, et epistolas Pauli decurtantes, hæc legitima esse dicunt, quæ ipsi minoraverunt. Irenaeus, III. c. 12. § 12.

4 "Marcion particulam evangelii tradidit suis. Similiter autem et apostoli Pauli epistolas abscidit." L. I. c. 27. § 2.

tailing the Gospel of Luke, they boast that they have a Gospel."[1] Now it is certain, and admitted even by those who would absolve Marcion from the charge of adulteration, that some of the omissions do favour the views of this heretic. Such for example, was the omission of Coloss. 1: 15, 16; concerning which, the declaration of Tertullian (adv. Marcionem, V, 19,) "hæc Marcioni displicere oportebat," does not imply that Marcion merely omitted that text; for immediately after he says: "quæ Marcion detraxit," i. e. which Marcion *severed* from his copy.[2] Such too was the omission of the first chapters of Luke, from ch. I—IV: 31; for Marcion's Gospel does not begin until the 31st verse of ch. IV.[3] It has indeed been asserted, in the "Dissertation on the genuine Gospel of Luke,"[4] that the omission of the first chapters of Luke seems contrary to the interest of an opposer of the Jewish Christians; because the account of the conception of Mary by the Holy Ghost, which rests exclusively[5] on the Gospel of Luke, subsequently became one of the prime discriminating doctrines between the Jewish Christians and those who adhered to Paul: but in the work on the "Object of the Gospel of John,"[6] it is remarked, that this omission accorded perfectly well with the system of Marcion, who denied the humanity and birth of Jesus, as is evident from Tertullian, contra Marcion. III. 2. 9. Compare Süskind, l. c. p. 19—22.

It would be a groundless conclusion, to infer that, because Tertullian does not specify more important omissions in the Gospel of Marcion, therefore no more existed. Tertullian him-

1 "Hoc quod est secundum Lucam evangelium decurtantes, gloriantur se habere evangelium," Lib. III. c. 14. § 4. See also many passages in Tertullian's five books against Marcion.

2 Comp. Tübing. gel. Anzeigen. No. 60, for 1795.

3 Turtullian adv. Mar. L. IV. 17.

4 Henke's Magazine, Vol. 5. pt. 3. p. 485 &c.

5 See, in contradiction of this assertion, Matt. 1: 18. 6 p. 260.

self asserts the contrary. He says that his object was, to confute Marcion with what occurred in his own Gospel: and he states, that he passed unnoticed many omissions in it. Thus he says: "It is evident, from our entire copy of the epistle to the Romans, how many chasms Marcion chose to make in it. I will avail myself only of such passages against him, as through negligence or blindness he omitted to expunge."[1] It is therefore not true, as seems to be supposed in the dissertation of Löffler,[2] that he promises to adduce in the sequel, other specimens of such omissions; for he merely appeals to the fact, that a comparison of Marcion's Gospel with our entire copy, would present them; and says that he will use such passages as were destructive of Marcion's system, and yet were retained in his Gospel. "Here again, I leap over a very large chasm in the mangled Scriptures; and seize upon a subsequent passage found in Marcion's text."[3] And "(Marcion) erased some things which militated against his opinion and were in favour of the Creator,—[i. e. which proved that the God who sent Christ, is really the Creator of the world; which tenet Marcion denied, S.]—pretending, that they were interpolations of the advocates of the Creator; but whatever accorded with his views, he retained. These I will collect, and to these adhere; provided they are in our favour, and confute the presumption of Marcion. Then it will appear, that the same heretical blindness expunged the former and retained the latter. Thus the design and form of my work will be preserved, when its basis is admitted by both

1 Quantas foveas in ista vel maxime epistola (ad Romanos) fecerit, auferendo, quæ voluit, de nostri instrumenti integritate parebit. Mihi sufficit, quæ proinde eradenda non vidit, quasi negligentias ac coecitates ejus accipere. Contra Marcionem, L. V. c. 13.

2 § VI.

3 Salio et hic amplissimum abruptum intercisæ scripturæ, sed apprehendo &c. L. V. c. 14.

parties."[1] See the review of Schelling's "Dissertatio de Marcione," in the Tübinger Gelehrten Anzeigen.[2]

Reply to obj. 2. The objection, that on the one hand, Marcion could have had no motive for many of the omissions found in his Gospel; and on the other, that his retaining so many things which are opposed to his system, cannot be accounted for; is answered by Arneth in the following manner: "The major part of his omissions may be accounted for by his system; and others are so explained by the Fathers, who certainly were better acquainted with his system than we. Those of less consequence may have been only common various readings, since the majority of them occur in other copies besides those of Marcion. Still some of his omissions remain unaccounted for; as well as the retention of a yet greater number of passages. But let it not be forgotten, that our acquaintance with Marcion's system is imperfect; and that, as many passages in Tertullian shew, he often took refuge in peculiar explanations. Nor are we authorized, considering the age and circumstances in which he lived, to ascribe to him the views, the penetration, the sound reasoning, and the learned precision of the present day."[3]

In the above mentioned dissertation of Süskind,[4] reasons are assigned for the retention and omission of a number of the particular passages in Marcion's Gospel.

Reply to obj. 3. Marcion must have rejected the Gospels of Mark and John, as well as that of Matthew; because John,

---

1 (Marcion) contraria quæque sententiæ suæ erasit, conspirantia cum Creatore, quasi ab assertoribus ejus intexta: competentia autem sententiae suæ reservavit. Hæc conveniemus, hæc amplectemur, si nobiscum magis fuerint, si Marcionis praesumptionem percusserint. Tunc et illa constabit eodem vitio hereticæ coecitatis erasa, quo et hæc reservata. Sic habebit intentio et forma opusculi nostri, sub illa utique conditione, quæ ex utraque parte condicta sit. L. IV. c. 6.

2 No. 60, for 1795; and compare Arneth, sup. cit. p. 7.

3 sup. cit. p. 39. 4 p. 17. s. p. 19—24.

and Peter the tutor of Mark, were Jewish apostles.[1] In his eyes, "they were (praevaricationis et simulationis suspecti usque ad depravationem Evangelii[2]) suspected of equivocation and deception, and even of corrupting the Gospel." Nay, according to Tertullian, the second chapter to the Galatians was Marcion's cardinal passage; from which he drew, by false interpretation, what he laid to the charge of the other apostles. Tertullian says: "But Marcion, having obtained the epistle of Paul to the Galatians, in which Paul censures even apostles themselves,[3] as having not walked uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel; and in which he likewise accuses some false prophets[4] of perverting the Gospel of Christ; labours to destroy the authority of those Gospels which were published with the names of the apostles or their scholars; that he might transfer to his own Gospel the authority of which he had robbed them."[5]

Reply to Objection 4. Although Marcion prefixed no name to his Gospel, still his canon contained no writings but those of Paul. This one fact is sufficient to show whose this Gospel was to be:[6] and his followers at least, professed that the conclusion of Marcion's Gospel was the work of Paul, (the other parts

1 "On the Object of John," p. 258. 2 Tertul. IV. 3. 3 Gal. 2: 14.

4 Gal. 2: 4. Compare Arneth, § XIV. p. 42.

5 Sed enim Marcion nactus epistolam Pauli ad Galatas, etiam ipsos apostolos suggillantis, ut non recto pede incedentes ad veritatem evangelii, simul et accusantis pseudapostolos quosdam, pervertentes evangelium Christi, connititur ad destruendum statum evangeliorum eorum, quæ proprio et sub Apostolorum nomine eduntur, vel etiam Apostolicorum, ut scilicit fidem, quam illis adimit suo conferat. L. IV. c. 3. That Marcion relied much on the epistle to the Galatians, appears also from his arrangement of Paul's epistles. The other nine epistles which he received, were all placed according to size; but the epistle to the Galatians, which is certainly smaller than those to the Corinthians and Romans, was placed first. This we learn from the 5th book of Tertullian against Marcion, in which he goes regularly through Marcion's Canon of Paul's epistles; and in chapter II. begins thus: "Principalem adversus Judaismum epistolam, nos quoque confitemur, quæ Galatas docet." See "Object of John," p. 255—258.

6 "Object of John," p. 259.

being derived from Christ himself.)[1] Inasmuch as Marcion's attack, (according to the passage of Tertullian,[2] adduced above,) was directed against all our four Gospels; it of course referred to the Gospel of Luke, which Marcion himself used, though the attack was directed only against the catholic or universally received (and according to him, adulterated) copy of Luke.[3]

A collection of the fragments of Marcion's Gospel, taken from Epiphanius, is found in Eichhorn's Introd. pt. I. p. 606—629; and another, from Tertullian and Epiphanius, in Arneth's work, p. 15—36.

Finally: it is not probable that the alterations contained in Marcion's Gospel, (which Tertullian evidently had in his possession, as he speaks so specifically of it, and of its deviations from the catholic Gospel,) had already been made in it when it fell into the hands of Marcion.[4] Because

There is nothing found in Marcion's Gospel, as far as we are acquainted with it, which may not have been taken from Luke.[5] It contains the same narratives as our Gospel, arranged in the same order, and couched in the same words. This is evident from Tertull. IV. 7 &c. The commencement of his Gospel: "Anno XV, principatus Tiberiani, (Deus) descendit in civitatem Galilææ Caphernaum," [in the fifteenth year of the administration of Tiberius, God descended to Capernaum, a city of Galilee,] Luke 4: 31, wears the aspect of an adulterated Gospel.[6] And

The fact that Marcion complains of designed interpolations

---

1 Dissertatio de catholicarum epistol. occasione, not. 124.

2 Contra Marcionem, IV. 3.

3 See Hänlein's Introd. to N. Test. sup. cit. p. 374.

4 See § 4. Ill. 1. of this work.

5 Dissertatio, de catholicarum epistolarum occasione et consilio, Not. 124. 1789.

6 "On the object of John," p. 259 &c.

in the catholic Gospel of Luke, whenever it differed from his, is calculated to awaken suspicion of adulteration on his part. Turtullian says: "If that Gospel of Luke which we possess, is the same that Marcion in his Antitheses charges with adulteration by the advocates of Judaism, in order to make the law and prophets harmonize with it, and thus to fabricate a Christ; it follows, that he could not have preferred this accusation against that Gospel, if he had not known it."[1] Moreover,

Tertullian uniformly assumes it as admitted, that Marcion professed to amend the Gospel of Luke. Marcion must therefore himself have made this profession; or at least never have asserted the contrary, that he found his Gospel in this altered state. Again,

If Marcion's Gospel had been one of the sources used by Luke; then this source would not be known in any other manner even by name. And

It would be something very remarkable, if so fruitful a source, as Marcion's Gospel must have been, had contained nothing of the baptism of Jesus, or of his entrance into Jerusalem. And

Luke must certainly have been the author of a larger portion of the Gospel which bears his name, than he could have been on the supposition of his having drawn from so rich a source as the Gospel of Marcion; this is evident from the preface of Luke's Gospel itself, and from a comparison of it with those parts of the Acts of the apostles which Luke composed independently and alone.

---

1 "Si id evangelium, quod Lucæ refertur, penes nos ipsum est, quod Marcion per Antitheses suas arguit, ut interpolatum a protectoribus Judaismi ad concorporationem legis et prophetarum, qua etiam Christum inde confingerent: utique non potuisset arguere, nisi quod invenerat."

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Testimony of the heretics. They acknowledged the genuineness of the homologoumena, while they denied the authority of their authors.

The Ebionites rejected the epistles of Paul, not because they denied Paul to be the author of them, but because they regarded Paul himself as an apostate from the Mosaic law: "Ebionei (says Irenaeus[1]) Apostolum Paulum recusant, apostatam eum legis dicentes." It was doubtless for the same reason, that they rejected the Gospel of Luke; because it was the production of a companion of the apostle Paul, and was commonly abscribed to Paul himself. See the preceding Illustration. The meaning, in the passage of Irenaeus which treats of the Ebionites,[2] is not: "Those who reject the apostle Paul, (the Ebionites,) receive that portion of the Gospel history and doctrine, which is found in Luke alone; and therefore they are bound to admit what Luke testifies of Paul in the Acts of the apostles;" but the meaning of Irenaeus was this: "The Ebionites who reject Luke, thereby rob themselves of many indispensably necessary parts of the history of Christ, which are found only in Luke; they therefore do not possess a complete Gospel history." He reasons thus: "If they reject the authority of the apostle Paul, then they must discard Luke, who in his Acts of the apostles, gives an account of the election of Paul to the apostleship; but if they discard Luke, they deprive themselves of those important parts of the Gospel history, which are contain-

---

1 Lib. I. c. 26. § 2.

2 Eadem autem dicimus iterum et his, qui Paulum apostolum non cognoscant, quoniam (quod) aut reliquis verbis Evangelii, quae per solum Lucam in nostram venerunt agnitionem, renuntiare debent, et non uti eis; aut si illa recipiunt omnia, habent necessitatem, recipere etiam eam testificationem, quae est de Paulo. III, 15, § 1.

ed in Luke alone.[1] And as they cannot acknowledge the apostolic authority of Paul, because they reject the Acts of the Apostles; they are guilty of despising a choice made by Christ himself, which rests on the testimony of Luke. But that Luke's narrative is not true, is what they are unable to prove: for by the very fact, that God committed to Luke alone, the charge of recording (in his Gospel) a large and essential part of the history of Jesus, he confers credibility on his narrative of the history and doctrines of the apostles." — Although the Gospel of Luke was held in no estimation by the Ebionites, in consequence of the person of its author, and although they used exclusively the Gospel of Matthew;[2] still it will not follow, that the reason why they esteemed the Gospels of Mark and John so little, was either because they entertained no personal respect for these men, (for it is admitted that Peter, the tutor of Mark, and John, were held in the most respectful estimation by the Jewish christians;) or because they denied the genuineness of the Gospels which were attributed to John and to the pupil of Peter. Perhaps the Gospel of John was not admitted into the canon of the Ebionites, because it was published at a very late period, and thus was unknown to this sect of Jewish christians, till the time when they were prejudiced against all productions which came from the gentile christians. The Gospel of Matthew was preferred to the earlier one of Mark, in consequence of its being written in the vernacular tongue of Palestine, the seat of the Ebionites.

Marcion, on the other hand, who admitted the authority of the apostle Paul alone, rejected the Gospels of Matthew, of Mark (or Peter) and of John; not however because he denied

[1] And that this was really the case, is evident from the fact that those, who according to L. I. c. 26. § 2. rejected the apostle Paul, used no other Gospel than that of Matthew.

[2] Irenaeus, Lib. I. c. 26. § 2. III. c. 11. § 7.

their genuineness; but because he denied their authors to possess any authority, they being apostles of the circumcision, whom Paul himself had rebuked. See Illustration 8th, note. In like manner, it must be supposed that the reason why Marcion rejected the Acts of the apostles, was not that he denied Luke to be its author; but because the Acts of the apostles was not ascribed to Paul, as the Gospel of Luke was; (see Illust. 8th); and because the book of Acts speaks favourably of the apostles of the circumcision, to whom Marcion was opposed. And this will remove the objection, which has been urged against the opinion that Marcion's Gospel was an adulterated copy of Luke's Gospel, viz. that if it were so, then Marcion would doubtless have received the other production of the same Luke, the Acts of the apostles.[1]

In order to account for Marcion's rejecting the epistles to Timothy and Titus from his collection of Paul's epistles, it is not necessary to suppose, that he doubted their genuineness. "Perhaps the reason for their omission[2] was, that they seem to have been intended rather for ministers than for churches at large, and Marcion intended in his canon to specify only those books which were to be read publicly." Löffler and others suppose, that these epistles had not yet come to his knowledge. Compare what is said in Arneth's work, p. 44, in favour of the supposition, that Marcion was acquainted with more of the New Testament writings than are contained in his canon.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

The nature of the objections of later heretics, proves the genuineness of the homologoumena.

[And when in the course of time, those heretics began to dispute even the genuineness of these writings, they did not

1 Schmidt's Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengesch. part I. p. 264.

2 "The Object of John," p. 257.

urge the want of ancient testimony in their favour, or attempt to impugn their genuineness with any historical objections; but they were contented to adduce some trifling, pretended, doctrinal objections, extorted from the books themselves.]

Such were the objections of the Alogians,[1] against the Gospel of John. They[2] denied the continuance of the extraordinary gifts of the spirit in the church, in opposition to the Montanists; but they could not defend themselves against their opponents, without absolutely rejecting the Gospel of John, which contained the promise of the Paraclete. Their solicitude to disprove the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, preponderated over every historical argument which could be adduced. Irenaeus remarks: "But others do not admit the representation given in the Gospel of John, in which the Lord promised that he would send the Paraclete (Comforter); but reject both this prophetic spirit and the Gospel itself; in order that they may oppose the gift of the spirit, which according to the decree of the Father, was poured out upon the human family in these late days."[3] It was only the later Alogians, who without hesitation ascribed the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse to Cerinthus.[4]

---

1 It was the opinion of Dr Lardner, that no heretics ever existed, who rejected the Gospel and first epistle of John, and yet received the other Gospels and the other books of the New Testament, as these Alogians are supposed to have done.—They were so called probably, because they "rejected God the Logos," as Epiphanius informs us, (p. 396, 397); the name *α-λογοι* being expressive of their sentiments. Dr Lardner therefore maintained, that "as no notice is taken of them in Irenaeus, Eusebius or any other ancient writer before Philaster and Epiphanius," this heresy was probably invented upon the occasion of the controversy with the Millenarians. See also Dr Semler's Historische Einleitung &c. 2 Abschn. 1 Abth. 3. Hauptst. § 38. Anmerk 204. S.

2 "The Object of John," § 24—27.

3 Alii vero, ut donum spiritus frustrentur, quod in novissimis temporibus secundum placitum patris effusum est in humanum genus, illam speciem non admittunt, quae est secundum Joannis Evangelium, in qua Paracletum se missurum Dominus promisit, sed simul et Evangelium et propheticum repellunt spiritum." Irenaeus adv. Hæres. III. 11. 9.

4 Sup. cit. p. 69, 70. Compare Tübing. Mag. No. 6. p. 116—118, and No. 11. p. 91. and Wegscheider's Introd. to the Gospel of John, p. 101—103. Eichhorn's Introd. part. II. p. 243.

Such also were the doubts of some unknown persons mentioned by Origin, as to the genuineness of the second epistle to Timothy. The remark of Origen [1] is this: "Some have ventured to reject the second epistle to Timothy, on account of the passage 2 Tim. 3: 8. (*Ιαννης και Ιαμβρης αντεστησαν Μωϋσει,*) quasi habentem in se textum alicujus secreti;[2] but they were not able to substantiate their opinion."

Similar were the objections of Faustus, to the genuineness of the Gospels and the writings of Paul. The principal arguments of this Manichaean against the writings of the New Testament, were their inconsistency with many parts of his system, and other trifling internal considerations.[3]

On the collective evidence of the orthodox and heretics for the books of the New Testament, see Hänlein's Introduction to the New Test. (pt. I. p. 72—108.) Kleuker on the genuineness and credibility of the manuscript records of Christianity, (pt. III. Vol. I. p. 349—468.) Hug has collected, from the fragments of the heretics of the 2d century, testimonies in favour of all the homologoumena of the New Testament, except the epistle to Titus. (See his Introd. pt. I. p. 41—83.)

---

1 Opera T. XII. edit. Würtzb. p. 249.

2 i. e. some have rejected 2 Tim. 3: 8, (Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses,) as if this passage contained something mysterious. S.

3 See Michaelis Introd. N.T. § 2. and "On the Object of John," p. 222.

§ 3. *Genuineness of the antilegomena, or disputed books.*

Origen (1) and Eusebius (2) both acknowledge, that the Apocalypse was unanimously received as genuine, by the earliest writers; yet the former was a strenuous opposer of the Chiliasts, and the latter not an unprejudiced witness. (3) With this acknowledgment, the testimony of the earliest writings which have reached us, perfectly accords. (4) And even the open assailants of the Apocalypse, do not venture to deny, that in the first ages of christianity, it was acknowledged to be a production of the apostle John.(5) The Apocalypse might therefore have been received into the number of the homologoumena.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was unanimously ascribed to the apostle Paul, by the writers of the Greek church; it was only the Latin church, led by an error that can be accounted for, which receded from the original and more correct opinion relative to the author of this epistle. (6)

Finally, we have also conclusive evidence in favour of the genuineness of the other disputed books, namely, the second and third epistles of John, the second epistle of Peter, the epistle of James and that of Jude. (7)

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Testimony of Origen for the genuineness of the Apocalypse.

The following evidence, derived from Origen, is discussed in the "New Apology for the Revelation," § 6, and in the work "On the Object of John," § 32.

According to Eusebius, [1] Origen has these remarks, in the fifth section of his Explanation of the Gospel of John: "But

[1] Eccles. Hist. VI. 25.

what shall be said of John, who reclined upon the breast of Jesus? He left a single Gospel; acknowledging at the same time, that he could have written so many that the world could not contain them. He also wrote the Apocalypse; in which he was commanded to be silent and not to record the voices of the seven thunders. He has also left an epistle of but few lines; perhaps also a second and a third, but these are not universally acknowledged to be genuine."[1]

Semler and Merkel, (see the work, "Proof that the Apocalypse is a spurious book,") have attempted to invalidate the force of this very distinct testimony of Origen, in the following manner:

First, by the supposition, that Origen here may, perhaps, not have spoken from personal conviction; but have permitted himself to use a mendacium theologicum (theological falsehood,) for good reasons, accommodating himself to the opinion of the churches in Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia and other places.—But in reply to this, it may be observed, that there is no historical proof that Origen was under any necessity of accommodating himself to the opinion of certain oriental churches; or that he would have suffered himself to do so. Origen himself often makes use of the Apocalypse, and without any urgent reason: and the testimony above mentioned, is not found in a homily addressed to the populace; but in an exegetical work on the Gospel of John. If Origen's private opinion, as to the origin of the Apocalypse, had differed from this; his disciple Dionysius, who did not acknowledge John to be its author, would have

[1] *τι δει περι του αναπεσοντος λεγειν επι το στηθος του Ιησου, Ιωαννου; ὃς ευαγγελιον ἑν καταλελοιπεν, ὁμολογων, δυνασθαι τοσαυτα ποιησειν, ἁ ουδε ὁ κοσμος χωρησαι εδυνατο· εγραψε δε και την Αποκαλυψιν, κελευσθεις σιωπησαι και μη γραψαι τας των ἑπτα βροντων φωνας. Καταλελοιπε δε και επιστολην πανυ ολιγων στιχων· εστω δε και δευτεραν και τριτην· επει ου παντες φασι γνησιους ειναι ταυτας.*

produced the opinion of his illustrious tutor in support of his own, rather than have rested on other trivial grounds. Finally; had Origen possessed any different information, relative to the author of the Apocalypse, no reason can be assigned why he should have hesitated to produce it. In the context of this very passage, he mentions that the second and third epistles of John were not universally received as genuine; and immediately after this passage, he makes the following remark on the epistle to the Hebrews:[1] "Those churches, which receive this epistle as a production of Paul, do well; for it was not without reason that this opinion was entertained by the ancients; the contents belong to Paul, but the style is not his: who the writer was, God only knows." Why might he not have passed a similar judgment on the Apocalypse, if he had any reason to doubt its genuineness?

Secondly, Merkel urges this supposition: "Perhaps Origen would have expressed a different opinion, concerning the author of this book, if he had written an exposition of it, or if he had given his opinion in the latter part of his life."—But we know that, precisely at that time, he still regarded the Apocalypse as a prophetical book of John; as we learn from his reply to Celsus, L. VI. § 6. 23, which Eusebius informs us, Origin wrote in his old age.[2]

Thirdly, Merkel makes this additional objection: "Origen generally, makes little discrimination between genuine and supposititious works, and was very negligent in examining the historical evidence of the genuineness of any book."—But Origen on the contrary, while treating of the antilegomena, does very frequently, and sometimes without any particular necessity, remark that they were not universally admitted to be genuine; as may be seen § 2. Ill. 1. 6. of this work, and in Süskind's Mag-

[1] Euseb. Eccl. Hist. VI. 25. [2] Euseb. Hsst. Eccl. VI. 36.

azine for Christian Dogmatics.[1] This is therefore an unjust accusation, that he is negligent or careless in examining the genuineness of books.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The testimony of Eusebius for the genuineness of the Apocalypse.

The principal passages in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, in which he speaks of the Revelation of Saint John, are the three following:

I. "As to the Apocalypse, the greater part are fluctuating in their opinions; but from the testimony of the ancients, to be adduced in due season, it shall be made evident, what judgment we are to form of it."[3]

II. "The Apocalypse of John may, if it be thought proper, be classed with the homologoumena. The opinions concerning it, shall be stated at a proper time." And after a few lines, he says: "We may also, as I remarked, if it is thought proper, class the Apocalypse of John among the disputed books; which some, as I have stated, reject, and others class with the homologoumena."[4]

III. Eusebius quotes a passage from Papias, in which the latter says: "He had always made very careful inquiry concerning the oral declarations of the ancients, (*λογους των πρεσβυτερων,*) what Andrew or Peter, Philip, Thomas, James or John

---

1 No. 9. p. 17—26.

2 See Eichhorn's Introd. to N. Test. Vol. 2. second part, p. 400 &c.

3 *της δε Αποκαλυψεως εφ' ἑκατερον ετι νυν παρα τοις πολλοις περιελκεται ἡ δοξα· ὁμως γε μην εκ της των αρχαιων μαρτυριας εν οικειῳ καιρῳ την επικρισιν δεξεται και αυτη.* H. E. III. 24.

4 *επι τουτοις (ὁμολογουμενοις) τακτεον, ειγε φανειη, την Αποκαλυψιν Ἰωαννου· περι ἡς τα δοξαντα κατα καιρον εκθησομεθα. —ετι τε (εν τοις νοθοις κατατεταχθω,) ὡς εφην, ἡ Ἰωαννου Αποκαλυψις, ει φανειη, ἡν τινες, ὡς εφην, αθετουσιν, ἑτεροι δε εγκρινουσι τοις ὁμολογουμενοις.* H. E. III. 25.

or Matthew or any other disciple of Jesus had said; what Aristion and John the Elder, (*ὁ πρεσβυτερος Ιωαννης*,) the disciples of the Lord, say." Here Eusebius considers it remarkable, that Papias should mention the name of John twice, and once in connexion with such as were not apostles; and that he distinguishes the latter John by the word *πρεσβυτερος*. He adds, that this confirms the opinion of *two* persons of that name having lived in Asia; and then remarks, that there were still known in Ephesus two graves, each of which was termed the grave of John; and concludes with these words: "These things deserve attention; for it is probable, that it was the second John to whom the Revelation was made, if we will not rather admit that it was the first."[1]

These passages afford the following result: Eusebius found, among ancient writers, none who disputed the genuineness of the Revelation; for if he had, how could he have said: "The Apocalypse may be classed with the homologoumena, if it is thought proper." Indeed, he appears in another passage to have tacitly classed it among the undisputed books; for he says[2] that Clemens of Alexandria, in his Hypotyposibus, made extracts from all the books of the Holy Scriptures, (*πασης της ενδιαθηκου γραφης*), not excepting the disputed books, (*τας αντιλεγομενας*), the epistle of Jude and the other catholic epistles, the epistle of Barnabas and the Revelation of Peter. He then, immediately afterwards, speaks of the epistle to the Hebrews. Now as Eusebius does not mention the Apocalypse, among the antilegomena; and as Clemens of Alexandria, who quotes[3] the Apocalypse, and therefore must have been acquainted with

---

[1] *οἰς και αναγκαιον προσεχειν τον νουν· εικος γαρ τον δευτερον, ει μη τις εθελοι τον πρωτον, την επ' ονοματος φερομενην Ιωαννου αποκαλυψιν ἑωρακεναι.* Eccl. Hist. III. 39.

[2] Euseb. Eccl. Hist. VI. 14.

[3] Stromat. VI. ed. Colon. 1688. p. 661. Pædagog. L. II. p. 201.

it, probably did not exclude it in his Hypotyposibus; we are warranted in saying, that Eusebius has here tacitly assigned it a place among the homologoumena. Nor does he, in the course of his whole ecclesiastical history, mention any ancient different opinion, excepting that of Caius and some others who ascribed it to Cerinthus. The *τινες* [*some*] therefore, whose objection to its genuineness is the reason why he states that "the Apocalypse may be ranked among the antilegomena, if it is thought proper,"[1] would accordingly be no other than Dionysius;[2] who denied that the Apocalypse is a production of Saint John, merely from internal reasons. The disposition of Eusebius to adopt as his own the opinion of this Dionysius, (whom, in the preface to the seventh book of his ecclesiastical history, he denominates the great bishop of Alexandria,) is manifest, not only from his wavering remarks on it, III. 25, but particularly from III. 39, where he seizes with so much eagerness, the opportunity for favouring the hypothesis that the Apocalypse was the production of some other John. But this same passage also proves that he still felt some timidity in asserting this hypothesis; as he adds: "if we would not rather receive the Apocalypse as the production of the first John (the apostle.") It cannot be admitted, that the *τινες, οἱ αθετουσι την Αποκαλυψιν του Ιωαννου*, i. e. some, who reject the Apocalypse of John, were those who attributed it to the heretic Cerinthus, namely Caius and the Alogians; because, if Eusebius had alluded only to the opinion of such as ascribed it to Cerinthus the heretic, he would have been obliged to place it among the third class, or that of heretical writings.

Eichhorn, whose Introduction may be consulted on the declarations of Eusebius relative to the Apocalypse,[3] regards

[1] Eccles. Hist. III. 25. [2] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. VII. 25.
[3] Vol. II. part. 2d p. 421—425.

these *τινας* as persons who were contemporaneous with Eusebius, but whose testimony cannot determine the genuineness of the Apocalypse, as they lived in so late an age. Hug, in his Introd.[1] also infers from Eusebius III. 25, that the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria was a popular one in the days of Eusebius.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Testimony of Dionysius himself, to whose opinion Eusebius inclines.

Dionysius, the bishop of Alexandria, although as much prejudiced against the Revelation as Eusebius, is as little able as either Origen or Eusebius, to advance any testimony of witnesses before his time, against the genuineness of this book. The reader may consult "On the Object of John," p. 73, 79 &c. 137—141 : and compare the "Apology for the Revelation, § 5. Eusebius[2] makes ample quotations from Dionysius' second book "On the Promises," *περι επαγγελιων.* This work was written against the followers of Nepos, who was well known in Egypt, about the middle of the third century, as the defender of the views of the Chiliasts. According to Eusebius, Dionysius makes the following remarks: "that before his time, some (*τινες προ ἡμων*, i. e. the Alogians,) had rejected this book, and ascribed it to Cerinthus: but he himself would not presume to reject it; as many of his Christian brethren held it in high estimation :—*εγω δε αθετησαι μεν ουκ αν τολμησαιμι το βιβλιον, πολλων αυτο δια σπουδης εχοντων αδελφων.*"—The *πολλοι αδελφοι* (many christian brethren), seem to be a counterpart to the *τινες προ ἡμων*, who rejected the Apocalypse; and also to have been Christians, who lived before his time."[3]—"That, although he himself is unable to com-

1 Part I. p. 108 &c. 2 Eccles. Hist. VII. 25.

3 See "On the object of John," p. 73, 138.

prehend the Apocalypse, he would be far from rejecting it on that account; that he believes it to be the production of an orthodox Christian, who wrote it by divine inspiration,—*ἁγιου τινος και θεοπνευστου ειναι συναινω*· but that he cannot well admit (*ου ῥαδιως αν συνθοιμι*) it to be a production of the apostle John, the son of Zebedee and brother of James, and author of the Gospel and catholic epistle; because the entire character of the Apocalypse, as to its matter and form, its contents and style, thoughts and expression, *ηθος, λογων ειδος, νοηματα, ῥηματα και συνταξις των ῥηματων, φρασις*, is different from the Gospel and first epistle of John. Particularly, that the apostle John never mentions his own name in the Gospel, or first epistle; but that the author of the Apocalypse repeatedly does.[1] That he therefore believes the Apocalypse to be the production of another John, who had resided in Asia." From these ample quotations of Eusebius, we perceive that the opinion of Dionysius was mere conjecture, built on internal evidence; that he adduces no testimony of earlier witnesses against the Revelation, except of those who ascribed it to Cerinthus;—yet to such testimony he would undoubtedly have appealed, had he been acquainted with any; for he was an enemy of the Chiliasts, and laboured to detract from the authority of the Revelation, or at least to disprove its being a production of the apostle John;—and finally, that it is not without some distrust and timidity, that he himself proposes his hypothesis.[2]

Moreover, it is not improbable that the influence of Dionysius, together with the prevailing animosity against the Chiliasts, and the obscurity of the Apocalypse itself, contributed much to bring suspicion on the genuineness of this book, pretty generally

[1] The internal arguments, which Dionysius urges against the genuineness of the Revelation, are refuted in Eichhorn's Introdution, sup. cit. § 196. p. 435—443.

[2] Comp. Schmidt's Introd. part II. p. 20. Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 418 &c.

in the Greek church, during the latter part of the fourth century.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The testimony of the writers prior to Origen and Eusebius, is decidedly in favour of the Apocalypse.

An investigation of the more ancient testimony, reaching beyond the time of Origen and Eusebius, affords the following results.

I. In the phrase, *at the last trump*, *εν εσχατῃ σαλπιγγι*, used by Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians,[2] there seems to be an allusion to the Apocalypse, 10: 7. 11: 15—18; or rather the apostle seems to presuppose this Apocalyptical mark of time to be already known.[3] There is nothing in the whole context of Paul, which can serve to explain this phraseology. Nor can it be proved historically, that the Jewish conceits of the seven trumpets, were current among them so early as the age of Paul. But even if they were, and Paul meant to allude to them, and presupposed them known to his readers, he would have expressed himself in a different manner. For according to the Jewish sayings, the dead were to be resuscitated gradually, during the sound of all the seven trumpets; but according to this passage of Paul, only at the sound of the last trumpet, and in the twinkling of an eye, *εν ατομῳ*. — The first epistle to the Corinthians was written at Ephesus,[4] whither the Revelation was also sent.[5]—See the objections to this argument in Paulus' Observ. ad argumenta de origine Apoc. Joanneæ externa, Jen. 1800. p. 9 &c. and compare the reply to them in the programm. Symb. ad illustranda ea loca, quæ de *παρουσια* Christi agunt, part II. p. 4—11.

---

1 See the "Apology for the Revelation," p. 40—43. and "On the Object of John," p. 140 &c.

2 Chap. XV. 52.

3 See "Apol. for Revel." § 13. and "On the Object of John," § 30.

4 1 Cor. 16: 8.

5 Rev. 2: 1.

II. Neither Papias, Polycarp nor Ignatius quotes the book of Revelation.[1] Neither does the first of these writers quote any other book of the New Testament; and yet it is certain, that he was acquainted with them. He himself informs us,[2] that he confined himself to the oral declarations of the acquaintances of the apostles; and did not intend to quote the apostolical writings.

Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, consists of only a few pages, and contains no quotation, either from the Gospel or the Revelation of John; although he had as much reason to cite the former as the latter. The epistles of Ignatius, four of which were addressed to Smyrna, Ephesus, and Philadelphia, whither the Revelation was also sent, have most probably been much altered and interpolated:[3]—but even admitting that the Apocalypse was not quoted in his epistles as they came from his hands, this by no means proves, that he was unacquainted with the book; for in like manner, in his epistle to the Romans, he never quotes Paul's epistle to that church, with which he certainly was acquainted.[4]

III. The Revelation of St. John is wanting in the Peschito or old Syriac version.[5] But,

In the first place, it cannot be proved, that it was originally wanting in that version.—The apparent obscurity of the Rev-

---

1 Apology for Revel. § 11. 2 Euseb. Eccl. Hist. III. 39.

3 Apology for the Revel. p. 184. Compare Schmidt's Manual of the History of the Christian Church, pt. 1. p. 209 &c.

4 Compare Hug's Introduction, pt. II. p. 405 &c.

5 The Peschito, i. e. the right or exact version, was executed if not in the first century, at least in the early age of the church. It is used exclusively by all christians in Syria and the East; and Michaelis pronounces it to be the very best translation of the Greek Testament which he ever read, for the general ease, elegance and fidelity with which it has been executed. It however does not embrace all the books of the New Testament, but contains only the four Gospels, the Acts of the apostles, all the epistles of St. Paul, the first epistle of St. John and of St. Peter, and the epistle of St. James. S.

elation, and the fear of disseminating Chiliastic views, may have restrained the public use of it in the churches; and thus have made copies of it to be scarce:—and this would account for the want of them in the Syriac manuscripts which have been brought from Mesopotamia to Europe.

Secondly, it is certain that the book of Revelation was known among the Syriac christians before the sixth century, in the beginning of which the Philoxenian version was executed. Because

It is quoted in the fourth century, by Ephraim in his ascetic writings, as a production of John the divine. And

In the earlier part of the third century, Hippolitus, who was probably Bishop of Aden in Arabia felix, and was held in high estimation by the Syrians, vindicated the Apocalypse against the attacks of Caius.

And, in the second century, Theophilus bishop of Antioch, quotes passages from the Apocalypse,[1] in his work against Hermogenes.

See Hug's Introduction, part I. § 65. p. 298—301, and Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 432—435.

IV. Justin Martyr explicitly ascribes the Revelation to John, one of the apostles of the Lord. His words are: "A certain man of the name of *John*, in the Revelation which was given him, predicted &c."[2] From this we may infer, as is maintained in the "Apology for the Revelation," p. 306, that the Apocalypse was known to the Ebionite christians in Samaria, the native country of Justin.

V. Irenaeus not only ascribes, expressly, and in various passages, the book of Revelation to John the disciple of the

---

1 Euseb. Eccl. Hist. IV. 24.

2 *Ανηρ τις, ὁ ονομα Ιωαννης, εἰς των Αποστολων του Χριστου, εν Αποκαλυψει γενομενη αυτῳ—προεφητευσε, κ. τ. λ.* Dial. cum Tryph. c. 81. ed. Colon. p. 308.

Lord, and in one passage[1] specifically to the disciple of the Lord who had reclined upon the Saviour's breast; but he also appeals to faithful and ancient manuscripts of the Apocalypse, and to the testimony of personal acquaintances of the apostle, in support of the truth of the reading "six hundred and sixty six," Rev. 13: 18. He remarks: "This number is found in all the carefully executed and ancient transcripts; and is supported by the testimony of those, who had personally seen John himself."[2] But should it be objected, that Irenaeus may have received incorrect information from the personal acquaintances of John, in this instance as well as in another;[3] still, these acquaintances of John must have stated something, in which John was mentioned as the author of the book, containing the disputed reading. The grounds for receiving the testimony of Irenaeus, concerning a book published by John in Asia minor, have been stated above, (§ 2. Ill. 5. in the note following the testimony of Irenaeus); nor can they be destroyed, by the supposition that Irenaeus' Montanistic views may have inclined him to favour the Apocalypse. See "Apology for the Revelation," § 10. "On the Object of John," § 31.

VI. Clemens of Alexandria, in a certain place,[4] quotes the Apocalypse with these words, *ὡς φησιν, εν τῃ Αποκαλυψει, Ιωαννης*, i. e. as John says in the Apocalypse: and in another passage,[5] with the expression, *το περιοπτον της Αποστολικης φωνης*.[6]

VII. Tertullian declares very decisively for the genuineness of the Apocalypse, in this manner: "We have also in our favour the churches of John; for although Marcion rejected his Rev-

1 Adversus Hæreses, L. IV. cap. 20. § 11.

2 *εν πασι τοις σπουδαιοις και αρχαιοις αντιγραφοις του αριθμου τουτου κειμενου, και μαρτυρουντων αυτων εκεινων των κατ οψιν τον Ιωανὴν ἑωρακοτων*, Adv. Hær. V. c. 30. § 1.

3 Book II. c. 22. § 5.

4 Stromat. L. I. cap. 6.

5 Pædagog. Lib. 2, cap. 12.

6 See Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 399 &c.

elation, yet the whole series of Bishops, from the beginning, stand up for John as the author."[1]

VIII. Moreover, there are other data from which it may be inferred, that the Apocalypse was known in the earliest times, as a production of the apostle John. See "Apol. for Rev." p. 75—85, 165 &c.

Melito, who was bishop of Sardis during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, wrote on the Revelation of John, *περι της Αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννου* as we are informed by Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. IV. 26. Eusebius must have been acquainted with this work, for speaking of the writings of Melito and Apollinarius, he says: "These have come to our knowledge," *εις ημετεραν γνωσιν αφικται*, H. E. IV. 26. Of the writings of Apollinarius, he remarks: "Among the many works of Apollinarius which are extant, the following have come to my knowledge," *του Απολλιναριου πολλων παρα πολλοις σωζομενων τα εις ημας ελθοντα*, Ibid. c. 27. Had Melito harboured any doubt respecting the Revelation, Eusebius would certainly have mentioned the fact.[2] This Melito was the person, who instituted a very close examination relative to the canon of the Old Testament; as we learn from Eusebius, loc. sup. cit.

Praxeas, in the second century, adduces a passage of the Apocalypse (I. 8.) in support of his Patripassianism; although he was no longer a Montanist, when he published his heretical views relative to the doctrine of Christ's divinity; for of him, Tertullian makes the remark,[3] "prophetiam expulit et hæresin intulit," i. e. he cast out prophecy and brought in heresy.

Apollonius, (another writer in the latter part of the second century, against whom an entire book of the lost writings of

1 Habemus et Joannis ecclesias alumnas. Nam etsi apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit; ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Joannem stabit auctorem." Advers. Marc. L. IV. c. 5.

2 See Hug's Introd. pt. II p. 406.

3 Advers. Praxeam, c. 1.

Tertullian was directed,[1]) also adduced proofs from the Revelation of John, in his work against the Montanists. Eusebius says:[2] *κεχρηται δε και μαρτυριαις απο της Ιωαννου Αποκαλυψεως,* i.e. he made use of proofs taken from the Revelation of John.[3]

Tertullian himself[4] states objections against Montanism, which the catholic Christians derived from the book of Revelation; and he replies to them by other passages from the same book. It was the practice of Tertullian, when writing against his opposers, to adduce passages only from such books as were received as genuine by them.

Jerome, in his epistle to Dardanus, remarks that, contrary to the prevailing custom of the Greek church in that age, he received the Apocalypse; veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequens, qui plerumque ejus abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, sed quasi canonicis et ecclesiasticis, i. e. *following the authority of the ancient writers*, who indeed generally perverted its declarations, yet not by treating it as they sometimes did the Apocrypha, but while regarding it as a canonical book received by the churches.[5]

IX. On the other hand, it cannot be proved, that the Apocalypse was disputed before the third century.[6]

Irenaeus[7] does not say, that those opposers of the Montanists, who disputed the continuance of the extraordinary gifts of the spirit in the church, and who rejected the Gospel of John, rejected also the Apocalypse; but merely says: "Evangelium Johannis et propheticum repellunt spiritum, propheticam gratiam repellunt ex ecclesia." Even in Book V. 26 &c, where he speaks so circumstantially of the Apocalypse, he adduces no objections of those who were termed Alogians, against it.

1 Jerome, de viris illustribus, s. voce Apollonius.

2 Eccl. Hist. V. 18. 3 See Hug's Introd. Part. II. p. 496 &c.

4 De pudicitia, c. 19. 5 See "Apology for the Revelation," § 3.

6 See, "On the object of John," §§ 24, 25, 36, 34. p. 126 &c.

7 Adv. Haeres. III. c. 11. § 9.

When Dionysius, about the middle of the third century, says :[1] *τινες προ ἡμων ηθετηκασι την Αποκαλυψιν*, i. e. some before our day, have rejected the Revelation; it does not by any means follow, that these *some* lived so early as the second century. He uses the term *προανεπαυσατο*,[2] when speaking of Nepos who lived in the third century. Dionysius undoubtedly alluded to those Alogians, in the earlier part of the third century, who under the guidance of Caius, attributed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus.[3] Hug[4] thinks, he alluded to those his opponents, whom Nepos drew together by his Chiliasm, during the heat of the contests in regard to the Apocalypse.

It cannot be proved that the eighty fifth Apostolical Canon, which certainly doubted the genuineness of the Revelation, made its appearance prior to the fourth century; at which time it must be conceded, many entertained such doubts.[5]

Moreover, Origen would not have classed the Apocalypse among the universally received books, nor would Eusebius have left it optional to place it among the homologoumena, if any serious doubts had been entertained, in the catholic church, before their time, concerning its genuineness. See Illustrations 1, 2.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Even the open assailants of the Apocalypse do not deny, that this book was believed to be genuine, from the earliest times.

None of the earlier or later opposers of this book, has assailed it with historical arguments; nor been led to doubt its genuineness, by the want of historical testimony in its favour.

I. As the *Alogians* could not well have rejected the undis-

---

1 Euseb. Hist. Eccles. VII. 25. 2 Euseb. H. E. VII. 24.

3 Euseb. H. E. III. 28. comp. VII. 25. See also Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 416 &c. 4 Introd. pt. II. p. 410.

5 See "Apology for Revel." p. 57 &c. and "The Object of John," p. 126—133.

puted Gospel of John, for any other reason than this, that they were unable to defend themselves against the Montanists, without discarding the book which contained the promises of the Paraclete and of extraordinary gifts of the spirit;[1] so it might naturally have been expected, that for similar reasons, they would also reject the Revelation of John. According to the testimony of history,[2] it appears that Caius first took this course, in his dispute against the Montanist Proclus, under the Roman Bishop Zephyrinus. Eusebius says,[3] that Caius attributed the Revelations, which were circulated under the name of a great apostle, to Cerinthus, a vindicator of the personal reign of Christ on earth.[4] How easily might the Alogians, in the heat of controversy against the Montanists, have fallen upon the assertion, that the Revelation was not the production of John or of any other catholic christian, but of that heresiarch Cerinthus, before whom John is said to have fled from the bath?[5] Dionysius[6] specifies their objections to the Revelation: "They pass through the whole of this book from chapter to chapter, and shew that there is neither sense nor connexion in it; and they pronounce the superscription, which bears the name of John, to be spurious. They say, it cannot be called a Revelation, because it is in the highest degree obscure and unintelligible,— *σφοδρῳ και παχει κεκαλυμμενη τῳ της αγνοιας παραπετασματι*, covered

1 "On the Object of John's Gospel," § 27. Compare the passage of Irenaeus above quoted, L. III. c. 11. § 9.

2 Euseb. H. E. II. 25. III. 28. VI. 20. 3 H. E. III. 28.

4 See "On the Object of John's Gospel," p. 65 &c.—The opinion that Caius is speaking of the Apocalypse, is maintained by Schmidt, in his Introd. II. p. 14, and Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 414.—Hug on the contrary, (Part II. p. 419—421.) with Paulus, in Historia Cerinthi, P. I. § 30, believes that Caius refers to a spurious Revelation current under the name of some celebrated apostle. He appeals to it as a fact, that neither Eusebius himself, nor Jerome, nor Photius, mentions any unfavourable opinion entertained by Caius relative to the Revelation.

5 Apology for the Revelation, p. 121.

6 As quoted by Euseb. H. E. VII. 25.

by a strong and dense veil of ignorance;—that Cerinthus wrote it himself, for one of the fundamental principles of his system is, the personal reign of Christ on earth." Had this antichiliastic Dionysius been acquainted with any historical objections, which were urged by these people against the Revelation, he would undoubtedly have stated them, as he was so desirous to detract from the authority of this book.

Another internal proof, which the Alogians advanced against the genuineness of the Apocalypse, is still more insignificant. It is stated by Epiphanius, Hæres. 51.[1]

II. Dionysius himself questioned the genuineness of the Revelation, solely on the ground of internal evidence. See Ill. 4, of this section.

III. Finally: the later assailants of the Revelation likewise, were not induced by historical evidence to reject that book. It is historically certain, that the objections urged in the fourth century, were the obscurity of the book, and the Chiliastic views which it was supposed to contain.[2] Epiphanius ascribes the doubts of his contemporaries, not to the ancient historical accounts, but to their embarrassment, when they attempted its explanation.[3]—With the conclusion, to which we are brought by the discussion contained in this Illustration, Schmidt[4] and Hug[5] and Eichhorn[6] coincide.

Supplementary note.

On the internal evidence for and against the genuinenesss of the Apocalypse.

On this subject the reader may consult Kleuker's "Full investigation of the evidences for the genuineness and credibility

---

1 "On the Object of John's Gospel," p. 72—76. "Apolog. for the Revel." p. 93 &c. 2 "On the Object of John's Gospel," § 35.

3 "Apolog. for Revel." p. 20. 4 Pt. II. § 166.

5 Sup. cit. p. 408—416. 6 Sup. cit. § 194.

of the original records of christianity,"[1] Hänlein's Introduction,[2] Griesinger's Introduction,[3] and Eichhorn's Introduction.[4]

The principal internal evidences stated in these works, in favour of the genuineness of the Apocalypse, are the following:

1. This book must have been written in the apostolical *age;* —because, the description of the seven churches supposes an existing contest between Christianity and Judaism, and an oppression of the Christians by the Jews; consequently it involves a historical fact, which occurred only in the apostolic age. It likewise contains no traces of the destruction of Jerusalem, as a past event.

2. The historical interest and physiological fidelity with which it is penned, militate against the suspicion of its being supposititious. This is peculiarly applicable to the addresses to the angels of the seven churches, chap. I—III; in which the writer could not have had his eye on fictitious characters and circumstances.

This argument holds good against the hypothesis, that the seven apocalyptical epistles are a mere poetic fiction. Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 391, 403.

3. The apostle John here characterises himself:

In chap. I. 12, he professes to be John; and declares that he was an eye-witness, and an ear-witness, of the history of Jesus.[5]

In chap. I. 9, he professes to have been banished to the isle of Patmos, for being a minister of Christ; and this is precisely what we are told concerning the apostle John, by the unanimous tradition of the ancient church.

4. The style of the Apocalypse resembles that of the Gos-

---

[1] Vol. I. p. 379—439. [2] Part. I. § 20. p. 196—211.
[3] p. 232—242. [4] Sup. cit. § 191, 196—296.
[5] Eichhorn, sup. cit. 438.

pel and epistles of John, both in regard to the ideas and the phraseology. The reader may consult Schultze on the character and merits of John as a writer.[1]

The internal evidence against the Apocalypse, is derived

1. From the supposed obscurity and offensiveness of its contents, as well as from the doctrinal errors, contradictions &c, which some have imagined they could discover in it. This objection may be confronted by a correct explanation of the book, and by doctrinal arguments.

2. From the difference between the Apocalypse and other writings of John, in regard to matter and manner. But this diversity is accounted for, by the following considerations:

The Apocalypse was written earlier, than the Gospel and epistles of John. It was composed during the reign of Claudius or Nero, according to the "Apology for the Revelation," § 14.

Again, the difference in the nature of the subjects, necessarily led the writer to different methods of handling them.

The book of Revelation is written in imitation of the Hebrew prophets.—It is on this principle, that Eichhorn[2] accounts for the author's prefixing his name to the book; which is not the case with the Gospels and epistles. But in historical works also, it was not customary for the writer to prefix his name; as the example of the other three Gospels evinces. The first epistle of John is rather a dissertation than a letter.

Inferential remark on all the preceding Illustrations of this paragraph.

The discussion embraced in the five preceding Illustrations, clearly evinces the inaccuracy of the statement of Kleuker,[3]

---

1 Published Leipsic, 1803, p. 294 &c. See also Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 376 &c. 442. 2 Sup. cit. p. 438.

3 In his work "On the Origin and Object of the Revelation of John," published at Hamburg, 1800.

and which he presents as the result of an investigation of the testimony of antiquity: "That in the second and third centuries, no certain information could be found, respecting the author of the Apocalypse."

ILLUSTRATION 6.

View of the evidence for the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews.

The arguments, which prove the Epistle to the Hebrews to be a production of the Apostle Paul, are the following:

I. *The earliest writers of the Greek church, received the epistle to the Hebrews as a production of Paul.*

Jerome, a man of much erudition and extensive reading, appeals to the testimony of all ancient Greek writers, in the following words, extracted from his letter to Dardanus, § 3: "It is to be remarked, that this epistle, which is addressed to the Hebrews, was received as a production of the apostle Paul not only by the oriental churches, but *by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers;* although the greater part of us ascribe it either to Barnabas or Clemens:" and further on: "Nevertheless I receive it as genuine, not influenced by the prevailing opinion of the present day, but guided by the authority of the ancient writers."[1] The word plerique, (plerique nostrorum,) must refer to christians in the Latin church; and not to Eastern christians, with whom they are contrasted. See the Introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews, page 27, note.[2]

Eusebius, in his history, says: "The fourteen epistles of Paul are before the public, and well known; but it should not

---

1 "Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam, quae inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus, quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ, vel Clementis arbitrantur;" and farther on, "Nos eam suscipimus nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes."

2 See also Hug's Introd. p. 317, 319.

be forgotten, that some have rejected the epistle to the Hebrews, alleging that it was not received by the church of Rome as a production of Paul."[1]—Thus also Origen speaks[2] of persons who could not consistently admit the validity of arguments brought from the epistle to the Hebrews, if they followed the authority of those who rejected it, *αθετουντων την επιστολην*.—It does not follow, that the *τινες* of Eusebius, were writers; but even if they were, they did not appeal to older Greek writers, but only to the Roman church.[3] "This word *τινες* indicates merely an exception to the general opinion of the the Greeks, there being some who were influenced by respect or prepossession for the Romans: and this exception is itself a proof, that the Greek church at large acknowledged this epistle as a production of the apostle Paul, according to the well known principle, exceptio firmat regulam."[4] "The fact, that the Arians were the first in the Greek churches, whom history taxes with denying Paul to be the author of this epistle, adds no ordinary degree of weight to the declarations of Eusebius; and recommends his character, as a historian whom no predilection for a party could betray into a departure from historical truth."

Origen says: "It was not without cause, that the ancients regarded this as an epistle of Paul."[5] His own opinion was, that the ideas are those of Paul, though not the style. He therefore does not determine who the author was: *τις* (says he) *ὁ γραψας την επιστολην, το αληθες θεος οιδεν*, i. e. who it was

---

[1] *του Παυλου προδηλοι και σαφεις αἱ δεκατεσσαρες (επιστολαι) ὁτι γεμην τινες ηθετηκασι την προς ἑβραιους, προς της Ῥωμαιων εκκλησιας ὡς μη Παυλου ουσαν αυτην αντιλεγεσθαι φησαντες, ου δικαιον αγνοειν.* E. H. III. 3.

[2] Ep. ad Africanum, § 9. Comment. in Matt. 23: 37.

[3] Introd. to Heb. § 2. comp. Hug. p. 317.

[4] Hug. sup. cit. p. 320.

[5] *ουκ εικη οἱ αρχαιοι ανδρες ὡς Παυλου αυτην (ταυτην την επιστολην) παραδεδωκασι.* Euseb. H. E. VI. 25.

that wrote this epistle, God only knows. Had he been acquainted with any testimony against the genuineness of this epistle, he would not have failed to mention it.[1]

The hypotheses of Clemens of Alexandria and of Pantænus, concerning this epistle, seem to presuppose the voice of history to be that Paul was its author. "The remark," says Hug,[2] "was made in Alexandria, at an early day, that the style of the epistle to the Hebrews was strikingly diverse from that of the other writings of Paul. But although this observation appeared to lead directly to the idea of a different author, no one dared to deny that it was a production of this Apostle. So firm was their conviction of Paul's being its author, that apparently strong arguments to the contrary, could not shake their belief." Clemens Alexandrinus attempted to account for this difference between the style of this epistle, and that of the other writings of Paul, by supposing that Paul wrote the epistle in Hebrew, and that it was translated into Greek by Luke, to whose Acts of the apostles its style bore much resemblance.[3] The same writer accounts for Paul's neglecting to give a superscription to this epistle, by supposing it to be a measure of precaution, which the apostle adopted in order that the Jews might not be deterred from reading the epistle, by any thing repulsive in its commencement; for the Jews were prejudiced against him as being an apostle of the Gentiles. Pantænus attributes the omission to the modesty of Paul, which would not permit him, an apostle of the gentiles, to prefix his name to an epistle which was addressed to Jewish christians, who had heard the voice of the Saviour himself.[4]

Stephanus Gobarus, in Photii Biblioth. Cod. 232, does indeed say; "Irenaeus and his abbreviator Hippolytus, (who may both

---

[1] See the "Introd. to the Ep. to the Heb." § 4. p. XVII—XXIII, and Tüb. gelehrte anzeigen, sup. cit. p. 454 &c. [2] Sup. cit. p. 318.

[3] Euseb. H. E. VI. 14. [4] Euseb. sup. cit.

be classed with the writers of the Greek and oriental church,) declare, that the epistle to the Hebrews is not a production of Paul." But Stephanus Gobarus and Photius are doubtless guilty of a historical blunder; inferring that this epistle was rejected by Irenaeus and Hyppolytus, because it is not quoted by them; and then stating this their own inference, as if it were the express declaration of those writers. For in the same passage in which they attribute these declarations to Irenaeus and Hyppolytus, Stephanus is guilty of a similar error, and Photius of a much greater one.—It cannot well be supposed, that in some work now lost, Irenaeus denied the genuineness of this epistle; for such a fact would not have escaped the notice of Eusebius, who was so careful to collect the opinions of the ancients relative to this epistle. That Irenaeus quotes the epistle to the Hebrews, in one of his works now lost, we learn from Eusebius;[1] and the reason of his not citing it in his work against the gnostics, probably was, that the gnostics all rejected this epistle, which was so directly opposed to their system; and Irenaeus determined to confront them with such books only, as they themselves acknowledged to be genuine.[2] Hug accounts for this circumstance from the connexion of Irenaeus with the occidental church, in which, on account of the Montanists, the epistle to the Hebrews was used with cautious reluctance, even at that early day.[3]

It cannot be proved, that the translation of the epistle to the Hebrews, contained in the ancient Syriac version, the peschito, was made at a later date than that of the other books; and hence, it cannot be inferred from this version, that the epistle to the Hebrews was long doubted, and received into the canon only at a later day.[4]

II. The contrary opinion of the Latin church, which, as we

1 Hist. Eccl. V. 26. 2 See "Introd. to Heb." § 3.

3 Hug. sup. cit. 321 &c.

4 See "Introd. to Heb." § 13. Comp. Hug's Introd. pt. I. § 66. p. 301—304.

learn from Jerome, ascribed it to Barnabas [1] or Clemens, though old, is nevertheless unfounded.

The antiquity of this opinion is evinced by these two considerations: first; It can be proved from Tertullian and Epiphanius, that the epistle to the Hebrews was not in Marcion's canon; yet Tertullian no where reproaches Marcion for this omission. Secondly; Tertullian himself utters the following language relative to this book: "The doctrines of the apostles should be the principal source of instruction and direction, to one who is to preside over the church of God. I will however adduce the additional testimony of one of the companions of the apostles. For we have *the epistle of Barnabas to the Hebrews*, a man of so great authority, that Paul places him on an equality with himself, in point of abstinence, 1 Cor. 9: 6. And the epistle of Barnabas is certainly more used in the churches, than that apocryphal Shepherd of adulterers."[2]—The passage Heb. 6: 1 &c. is then adduced.[3]

It is probable, that the Latin church held this epistle in higher estimation, in more ancient times, than they did in the days of Tertullian. The epistle which Clemens wrote from Rome, in the name of the Roman church, to the Corinthians, and which was universally acknowledged as genuine; contained a great number of quotations from the epistle to the Hebrews. Eusebius says: "Clemens, in the universally received epistle, which he wrote in the name of the Roman church to the church

---

1 The supposition that Barnabas was author of the epistle to the Hebrews, has been advocated of late by Schmidt, in his Introduction to N. Test. part I. p. 289 &c.

2 Disciplina apostolorum proprie quidem instruit ac determinat principaliter sanctitatis omnis erga templum Dei antistitem. — Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis apostolorum testimonium superducere.— Extat enim et *Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos*, adeo satis auctoritatis viro, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiæ tenore, 1 Cor. 9: 6. Et utique receptior apud ecclesias Epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum. Tertul. de Pudicitia, c. 20.

3 See "Introd. to Epistle to Hebrews," § 5.

of the Corinthians, has taken many ideas from the epistle to the Hebrews; nay he even quotes passages verbatim, thus clearly evincing that this epistle is not a new production."[1] It can scarcely be supposed, that Clemens, in addressing a church in the name of another whole church, would have quoted so much from the epistle to the Hebrews, if it were then regarded merely as an epistle of Barnabas.[2]

Moreover, it is no improbable supposition, that the opinion adopted by the Latin church, (viz. that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by Barnabas,) was brought into circulation by Marcion. He was excommunicated by his father, the bishop of Pontus, who refused to restore him to membership in the church, and probably appealed to Hebrews 6: 4 &c. in justification of his conduct. These circumstances may well account for the enmity of Marcion against this book. He was unwilling it should pass for an epistle of Paul; and in order to give plausibility to his opposition, in the minds of persons resident in a country where authentic information was circulated relative to this epistle of Paul, which was directed to Galatia, in the vicinity of Pontus; he ascribed the epistle to Barnabas, the colleague of Paul, at the same time urging the circumstance that the name of Paul is not prefixed to it. In the view of Marcion, this epistle lost all its authority by being regarded as a production of Barnabas; for Barnabas, according to Galatians 2:13, was one of that company of Peter, which temporised with the Jews, he was one of those protectoribus Judæismi, who were so odious to Marcion. From Pontus he travelled to Rome: and if he concealed his heretical notions for a

[1] *Ὁ κλημηνς εν τῃ ανωμολογημενῃ πάρα πασιν (επιστολῃ,) ἣν εκ προσωπου της ῥωμαιων εκκλησιας τῃ κορινθιων διετυπωσατο, της προς ἑβραιους πολλα νοηματα παραθεις, ηδη δε και αυτολεξει ῥητοις τισιν εξ αυτης χρησαμενος σαφεστατα παριστησιν, ὁτι μη νεον ὑπαρχει το συγγραμμα.* Euseb. H. E. III. 38.

[2] See "Introd. to Ep. to the Heb." § 6.

time, his statement that the epistle to the Hebrews was a production of Barnabas, might naturally have been credited; as he had come from the country to which the epistle to the Hebrews, or Galatian Jewish christians, was directed, and as the name of the apostle was not prefixed to it. This opinion of Marcion, notwithstanding his public heresy, might still have been retained in the Latin church; especially as several other circumstances were calculated to cherish it, such as the remark made in the Greek church, that its style differed from that of the other epistles of Paul. This supposition is raised to probability by a fragment of the author of an ancient anonymous canon, published by Muratorius, containing these words: "fertur etiam ad Laudicenses (Laodicenses) sc. epistola, alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine fictæ, ad hæresin Marcionis," i. e. there is also an epistle to the Laodiceans, and another to the Alexandrians, fabricated under the name of Paul, in order to support the heresy of Marcion. The Latin church acknowledged thirteen epistles of Paul as indisputably genuine; two others, namely the epistle to the Laodiceans and that to the Hebrews, they commonly regarded as spurious, or at least as of doubtful genuineness.[1] Marcion did not fabricate an epistle to the Laodiceans; but as he was led by Coloss. 4: 16, to give to the epistle to the Ephesians the name of Epistle to the Laodiceans; the spurious epistle to the Laodiceans, which subsequently appeared, was, by mistake, ascribed to him.[2] The case was probably similar with regard to the epistle to the Hebrews. In the fragment above cited, the words "epistola ad Alexandrinos" are perhaps equivalent to the phrase "epistola ad Hebræos;" for the epistle to the Hebrews was written in Greek, and Jews who spoke Greek were therefore thought of, and among

[1] See Hieronymus de viris illustribus, s. v. Paulus.

[2] Epiphan. haeres. 42.

these the Alexandrians were the most celebrated. The author of that fragment erroneously ascribed this epistle to the Alexandrians or Hebrews to Marcion, because he had given to it the new superscription "Barnabæ titulus." Although the whole epistle is directly opposed to the system of Marcion, that great enemy of Judaism; still such a mistake is not improbable in a man, who was as little acquainted with Marcion's system, as with that of other heretics against whom he contends, and who was opposed to the epistle to the Hebrews on account of the passage ch. 4: 6 &c. which seemed to favour the rigid discipline of the Montanists.[1]

Hug, in his Introduction,[2] represents and explains the fact, that the Latin church denied the epistle to the Hebrews to be a production of Paul, in the following manner:

The occidental church was kept actively employed by the Montanists. In vindication of their tenet, that those guilty of grievous transgressions should be irrevocably cut off from the church, they relied especially on Hebrews 6: 4, 5; as we learn from Tertullian[3] and Jerome.[4] And hence, the ministers of the Latin church made cautious and sparing use of this epistle. Not long probably after the death of Irenaeus, the presbyter Caius assumed the tone of clamourous opposition against this epistle, in a work which he published against the Montanists.[5] And from that time, this opinion was adopted by the greater part of the Latin church. Even the Montanists themselves receded from their original position on this subject, and in their polemical works, received this epistle only as far as its authority

---

1 See "Introduction to Ep. to the Heb." § 7. Schmidt, in his Introd. pt. I. p. 284, remarks: "Perhaps the author confounded Marcion with some other heretic. Or Perhaps he did not wish to state, that the epistle was written in the name of Paul, in vindication of Marcion, but rather in opposition to him."

2 Sup. cit. p. 321—329.

3 De pudicitia, cap. 20.

4 Adv. Jovinian. L. II. u. 3.

5 Euseb. H. E. VI. 20.

was acknowledged by their opponents, namely as a production of an apostolical teacher, Barnabas or Clemens &c.[1] About forty years after Caius' attack, arose the Novatians, who, as we learn from Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Theodoret and others, also used the passage Hebrews 6:4, 5, as the principal defence of their tenets. While the Greeks were calm spectators of the contest, and evaded the argument from Heb. vi. by their interpretations; the Latin churches were led by the pressure of circumstances to deny the authority of the book, whose contents they were unable to refute. But the Latin churches had no ecclesiastical tradition, no authority of earlier churches, to which they could appeal; the whole controversy proceeded on the ground of internal evidence. It was for this reason, that Jerome and Augustine could not adopt the opinion of the church to which they belonged; because they were convinced of the contrary by the testimony of the ancients. And their influence tended to give, at a subsequent day, a different turn to the opinion of the Latin church.

II. The author of the second epistle of Peter, bears witness, that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.

The passage 2 Peter 3:15. "As our beloved brother Paul also—hath written unto you," is best explained as referring to the epistle to the Hebrews. The sentiment which immediately precedes these words, and concerning which the reader is reminded of what Paul had written, namely: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation,"[2] is no where ex-

[1] Tertullian is an example, De Pudicitia, c. 20.

[2] *την του κυριου ἡμων μακροθυμιαν, σωτηριαν ἡγεισθε*, i. e. believe that the delay of our Lord's coming will enhance our salvation. The passage in Hebrews, to which Peter is supposed to refer, is: *Και οὑτοι παντες, μαρτυρηθεντες δια της πιστεως, ουκ εκομισαντο την επαγγελιαν· του θεου περι ἡμων κρειττον τι προβλεψαμενου, ἱνα μη χωρις ἡμων τελειωθωσι·* which is properly rendered thus: but all these did not receive that which was promised, although they acquired a good report by their faith; for God intended something better for us, namely that they should not attain the crown before us. S.

pressly found except in Hebrews 11: 39, 40. The patient expectation of the great change, which shall occur at the coming of our Lord, and which is spoken of in 2 Pet. III, is no where so pressingly urged as in the epistle to the Hebrews, 10: 35 &c. 3: 6, 14. 12: 1—12. Nor is the exhortation to godliness any where so expressly connected with the promise of a great change, which heaven and earth are to experience,[1] as in the epistle to the Hebrews, 12: 25—28,[2] which according to the ancient accounts, was ascribed to the apostle Paul. Why, therefore, should we have recourse to the forced supposition, that Paul may have written another epistle which is unknown to us, but which contained a discussion of this subject?— As to the genuineness of this text, and indeed of the whole epistle of Peter, no valid objection can be urged. The text has a multitude of concurrent witnesses in its favour, and the genuineness of the whole epistle is established by satisfactory evidence. But even if this epistle were not written by Peter, it must have been published as early as the beginning of the second century; so that on this supposition, it proves that the epistle to the Hebrews was believed at

1 2 Pet. 3: 11.

2 This passage, *Βλεπετε μη—χαι ευλαβειας*, is translated in the following manner, by the learned and pious Dr Storr, in his excellent Commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews: "See that ye refuse not to hear him who is now speaking: for as those could not escape punishment, who refused to listen to the divine messages of the teacher on earth; much less can we escape, if we turn away from that heavenly teacher whose voice then shook the earth, but who hath now given this promise, "yet once more I will shake not only the earth, but also the heaven. The words "yet once more" indicate a change of that which is unstable, and which is so constituted that it awaits a permanent state. Therefore, as we have reason to expect a permanent kingdom, let us be thankful, and thus serve God in an acceptable manner, with reverence and fear." This version is supported by the best philological grounds, and nothing more is necessary than a recurrence to the original, and an exegetical investigation of the context, to show to the critical scholar its great superiority to the common English version. S.

the commencement of the second century, to be an epistle of Paul to Asia Minor.[1]

IV. This same passage, 2 Pet. 3 : 15, affords another argument of an inferential nature, for the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews; as it accounts for some circumstances in the epistle itself, which might otherwise be regarded as internal objections to Paul's being its author.

As the second epistle of Peter was addressed to the same churches as the first,[2] namely to those in Pontus, Galatia, Asia and Bithynia; and as Peter says that his brother Paul wrote also to them, ὑμῖν; it follows that the epistle to the Hebrews must have been addressed to at least one of the churches above named: the word ὑμῖν, 2 Peter 3: 15, does not necessarily include *all* the readers of these epistles of Peter.

Now the most probable opinion is, that it was addressed to the Hebrew or Jewish christians in Galatia. And if the epistle to the "Hebrews" or Jewish christians in Galatia, was sent with that to the "Galatians" or Gentile christians in Galatia; this will explain why Paul, contrary to his general custom, wrote an epistle exclusively for the Hebrew members of a church, which was composed of both Jewish and Gentile converts; for according to this supposition, each class of members received an epistle addressed particularly to itself.

The same supposition will also account for Paul's not prefixing his name to the epistle to the Hebrews; for it was sent together with that to the Galatians, which contained his name, into the same section of the country and to the same churches. The general scope of both epistles points to Jewish persecutors, and Judaizing false teachers; both treat of persecution and of Jewish seducers. Gal. 1: 7—9. 4: 17. comp. Heb. 13: 9. 12: 15 &c.—Gal. 3: 4. 4: 29. comp. Heb. 10: 32 &c. 12: 1—4. 13:

1 See Storr's "Introd. to Ep. to Hebrews," § 8, 10. Tübing. gel. Anzeigen, 1791, p. 457 &c.

2 2 Pet. 3: 1.

13. See the Introduction to Storr's Comm. on the Hebrews, p. LVIII—LXIX. The similarity of ideas in the III. and IV. chapters of the epistle to the Galatians with those of the epistle to the Hebrews, is illustrated in the "Programma de Consensu epistolarum Pauli ad Hebræos et Galatas, p. 7—16. A remarkable fact, in confirmation of the opinion that the epistle to the Galatians and that to the Hebrews belong together, is found in the division of the most ancient Vatican manuscript of the New Testament, Cod. 1209. In this manuscript, all the sections of the epistles of Paul are numbered. The last section of the epistle to the Galatians, is numbered LIX; and the sections of the epistle to the Hebrews are marked with the next succeeding numbers, LX—LXX; although in that manuscript, the epistle to the Hebrews does not follow immediately after that to the Galatians, but is placed last. Now the person who made that transcript, must have found those numbers in the manuscript from which he copied; for if he had made them himself, he would have placed the epistle to the Hebrews next to that to the Galatians, (as it comes next in the order of the numbers), and would not have placed there the epistle to the Ephesians, which begins with LXX.[1]

V. The contents and style of this epistle, not only contain no evidence against its genuineness, but really afford some proof that it is a production of Paul.[2]

1. The salutation from the Jewish christians who had been driven out of Italy, Heb. 13: 24, and the mention of Timothy as his fellow traveller, 13: 23, are very applicable to Paul.—Many have supposed that the words, *ὑπο των ακουσαντων εις ἡμας εβεβαιωθη*, [was confirmed unto us *by them that heard him*], seem to point out the writer as a disciple of the apostles; but his using the first person *ἡμας*, instead of the second, may

1 See the Programma, sup. cit. p. 16—18.

2 See Storr's Introd. to Comm. on Heb. § 10. and Hug, sup. cit. § 130, 132 &c.

well be considered an instance of that very common figure of speech, called *αναχοινωσις*, i. e. *communication*.

2. Not only does the general scope of this epistle tend to the same point, on which Paul lays so much stress in his other epistles, namely that we are justified and obtain salvation only through Jesus Christ, and that the Mosaic institutions cannot effect this object; but there are also various propositions in this epistle, which are found in the other writings of Paul.[1] And Berger, in his Dissertation entitled "The epistle to the Hebrews, a homily," finds so great a similarity between the epistle to the Hebrews and Paul's discourse, Acts 13: 16—41, that he believes this discourse might be regarded as an extract from that epistle, or vice versa, that epistle a commentary on this discourse.[2]

3. Warmth and energy of expression characterise this epistle, as they do the undisputed productions of Paul. Hebraisms of every kind abound in it, as in his other epistles. And finally, it contains particular expressions, phrases and collocations of words, which are either peculiar to Paul, or are most frequent in his writings.[3]

It is admitted that the reasoning in this epistle, is developed with much more circumspection and minuteness, than is usual in the other epistles of Paul. But why should this be an objection to its Pauline origin, when the writer himself informs us, 5: 11 &c,[4] that he aimed to develop every thing with clearness.[5]

---

1 See Hug, p. 312—315, and Meyer's "Representation of the doctrines of Paul." p. 310 &c. Altonæ, 1801.

2 Götting. Bibliothek der neuesten theol. Literatur, B. III. st. 3. s. 449 &c.

3 Hug, p. 315 &c.

4 The apostles words are: *περι ου πολυς ημιν ο λογος, και δυσερμηνευτος λεγειν, επι νωθροι γεγονατε ταις ακοαις*, which signify: Of which, (namely great High priest and salvation), I shall treat largely, and yet it will still be difficult to make the subject intelligible to you, because you are so dull of apprehension. S.

5 Hug, § 133.

On the subject of this Illustration, the reader is referred to the "Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews," Tübingen, 1789.[1]—The Programma, de Consensu epistolarum Pauli ad Hebræos et Galatas, Tübingen, 1791, and the Review of "Ziegler's Complete Introduction to the epistle to the Hebrews," Götting. 1791, in the Tübing. Gelehrt. Anzeigen, Nos. 57, 58, for 1791.—Kleuker's "Full Investigation of the grounds," &c. pt. I. p. 294—314. "On the Origin and Object of the apostolical Epistles," p. 174—222. Hänlein's Introd. pt. I. § 15. Griesinger's Introd. p. 186 &c.—and especially Hug's learned and acute vindication of the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews, in his "Introd. to the New Test." pt. II, § 126—134.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

View of the evidence which evinces the genuineness of the other disputed books, namely the second and third epistles of John, the second epistle of Peter, the epistle of James and that of Jude.

General remarks.

The following works contain general remarks on the antilegomena, and on the circumstances which occasioned doubts concerning them: Weber's "Contributions to the history of the New Testament canon;"[2] Hänlein's "Introduction to the New Testament;"[3] and Griesinger's "Introd. to the books of the New Covenant."[4] The result of their inquiries is, that various accidental causes may be assigned, which either actually did occasion, or at least might have occasioned the doubts which existed concerning these books, without diminishing at all our conviction of their genuineness. Not one of these books can be proved to be spurious. And when all the evidence for and

[1] The latest and an improved edition of this most valuable work of Dr Storr, was published at Tübingen in 1809. S.

[2] No. V. p. 158—177. [3] Pt. I. p. 109—115. [4] P. 5, 6.

against these books, both internal and external, is fairly weighed, the preponderance is always in their favour.

Particular remarks on the genuineness of each book.

I. *The second epistle of Peter.* This book was first placed among the disputed writings of the New Testament, by Origen.[1] It is natural to suppose, that if, from incidental causes, the second epistle of Peter did not become known so early as the first; some churches, which for a length of time had been accustomed to read but one epistle of Peter, might hesitate to receive another. Suspicion might also have arisen against the genuineness of this epistle, from the fact that it was brought from Asia Minor, the abode of the Montanists, who were accused [2] of a disposition to fabricate new writings; more especially may this have been the case, as the passage 2 Pet. 2:20, could be urged in vindication of the rigor of the Montanistic discipline. Or the departure of the christians in Asia Minor from the customary method of celebrating the Easter solemnities, may have produced in the eastern and western Christians an indisposition to receive this book.[3]

The genuineness of the second epistle of Peter is vindicated in the following works: Nietzsche: Epistola Petri posterior auctori suo imprimis contra Grotium vindicata atque asserta. Lipsiæ, 1785. Morus: Praelectiones in Jacobi et Petri epistolas, p. 214 &c. Pott: Epist. cathol. Vol. II. p. 163 &c. Commentatio, qua genuina secundae Petri epistolæ origo denuo defenditur. Tüb. 1806. Dahl: Commentatio exegetico-critica de *αυθεντια* epistolarum Petrinæ posterioris atque Judæ. Rostoch. 1807. sect. I—V. and Hug's Introduction, pt. II. p. 391 &c.

II. *The second and third epistles of John.* A striking similarity exists between these and the first epistle of John. And

---

1 Euseb. H. E. VI. 25. 2 Euseb. H. E. VI. 20.

3 See "Introd. to Epistle to the Hebrews," § 10.

the third epistle, which is addressed to Gaius, expressly refers (v. 9) to a communication addressed to the church of which Gaius was a member. Both these epistles were, doubtless, mere addresses, sent to two members of different churches, along with his Gospel and first epistle, which they were to publish in their respective churches. Now if, as may be supposed, the Gospel and first epistle of John were sent to various other churches, unaccompanied by these two addresses to individual persons; this will show why the two smaller epistles were wanting in some transcripts, and also account for doubts being entertained of their genuineness, in places where they were unknown until a later date. But it is evident from Irenaeus,[1] that in some copies, one or other of the smaller epistles was connected with the larger one; for that writer quotes passages from both the first and second epistles, as if taken from one and the same epistle. See "On the Object of the Gospel History and Epistles of John,"[2] Hug's Introduction,[3] and Eichhorn's Introd. to N. Test.[4]

III. *The epistle of James.* The great antiquity of this epistle is evinced by the following considerations:—first, it was received, with the homologoumena, into the old Syriac version:—Secondly, ideas and phrases are borrowed from it by Hermas in his Pastor, as has been proved by Semler.[5] The high antiquity of Pastor, may be inferred from the declaration of Eusebius, that it was regarded as the production of the Hermas mentioned Rom. 16: 14, and was used by some of the most ancient writers, *των παλιοτατων συγγραφιων*. He himself mentions the Pastor of Hermas immediately after the writings of the apostles, and before those of Justin and Ignatius:[6]—And thirdly,

---

1 Contr. Haer. Lib. 3. cap. 16. § 5. 8. 2 § 78 &c. p. 408 &c.
3 Part II. p. 342—347. 4 Vol. II. p. 320—327, 329 &c.
5 Prolegomena in Epistolam Jacobi, p. 14. compare Hug, pt. II. p. 364 &c.
6 Euseb. E. H. III. 3. and V. 8.

reference is had to this epistle even in the first epistle of Peter. It is probable from several passages, that either James had the first epistle of Peter before him, or Peter that of James. Compare James 4: 10, with 1 Pet. 5: 6, James 1: 2—4 with 1 Pet. 1 : 6, 7. James 1 : 18—21, with 1 Pet. 1 : 3, 21, 22. 2: 1, 2. This becomes the more probable, if both epistles were directed to the same churches, as may be supposed from the fact that both were directed to the *διασπορα*, or "dispersed," James 1: 1. 1 Pet. 1: 1 ; and especially if, as is probable, the passage James 4: 5 is borrowed from Paul's epistle to the Galatians (V. 17, 19—21,) a body of people who are expressly mentioned in the address of the first epistle of Peter. Now if one did borrow from the other, it is probable that James was the earlier writer. For, it is admitted that he died several years before Peter ; and Peter probably wrote his second epistle shortly after the first, (as may be inferred from the word *ηδη now*, or *so soon* 2 Pet. 3: 1,) and consequently wrote both not long before his death, 2 Pet. 1: 14. In regard, however, to James 4: 10, the context renders it probable, that James had Job 22 : 29, and not the first epistle of Peter, in view.[1]

That this epistle was written by James the son of Alpheus, called James the younger, is proved in the Dissertation on the epistle of James, in Opuscula Academica,[2] by the following internal arguments :

1. The epistle of James presupposes an acquaintance, not only with Paul's doctrine of *δικαιωσις* (justification), but also with the epistles to the Romans and Galatians. But this cannot apply to the older James, the brother of John ; for he had long before been put to death by Herod, Acts 12: 2.

2. Such acquaintance with the doctrines of Paul, is perfect-

1 See Dissertatio de catholicarum epistolarum occasione et consilio, not. 42. Dissertatio in epistolam Jacobi, not. 150, 148, 136. Comp. Hug. sup. cit. p. 378 &c.

2 Vol. II. p. 1—4.

ly applicable to the James, whom Paul saw twice at Jerusalem (Gal. 1: 19. 2: 9.), who delivered the address to the christian assembly at Jerusalem (Acts 15 : 13 &c.), and probably also wrote the letter mentioned in the subsequent verses, 22 &c. This James is called (Gal. 1: 19) *αδελφος κυριου*, "the Lord's brother:" and not only is he placed on an equality with the apostles, (Gal. 2: 9, *Ιακωβος και Κηφας και Ιωαννης, οἱ δοκουντες στυλοι ειναι*, "James and Cephas and John who seemed to be pillars,") but he is expressly spoken of as belonging to the number of the apostles,[1] Gal. 1: 19. Acts 9: 27.

IV. *The epistle of Jude.* This epistle was expressly ascribed to Jude by Tertullian,[2] in these words: (scriptura) Enoch apud Judam Apostolum testimonium possidet, i. e. the (apocryphal book) of Enoch has the testimony of the *apostle Jude* in its favour; and also by Origen, in his work De principiis.[3]

Inferential proof in favour of 2 Peter and James.

The epistle of Jude, which was used by the author of the book of Enoch, (a spurious work, which according to the testimony of ancient writers[4] was in the hands of the Christians as early as the second century and beginning of the third,) confirms the early existence of the second epistle of Peter, and the genuineness of the epistle of James. That the epistle of Jude was used by the author of the book of Enoch, needs no proof. It has been shown,[5] that the fabrication of this book was occasioned by the epistle of Jude. In the few fragments of it, preserved by Fabricius in his Pseudepigrapha N. T. there are traces of its being derived from a Christian. It contains a circum-

1 Compare, Spicilegium observationum in epistolam Jacobi catholicam. Tüb. 1806, and Hug's Introduction, pt. II. p. 354—361.

2 De Habitu muliebri, c. 3. 3 Lib. III. c. 2. § 1.

4 See the Dissertation de catholicarum epistolarum occasione et consilio, p. 34. 5 Dissert. sup. cit. p. 39 &c.

stantial account of the fall of the wicked angels, framed in accordance with the Alexandrian version of Gen. 6: 2; but why this should be introduced in a history of Enoch, cannot be accounted for, except by the supposition that the author was led to it by the sixth verse of Jude, and so must have had this epistle before him.[1]

The writer of the epistle of Jude, copied from the second of Peter, which proves the antiquity of that book. A comparison of Jude, v. 4 &c. with 2 Pet. 2: 1 &c. renders it very highly probable, that the author of one of these epistles had the other epistle before him. Now Jude first presents to his hearers, (v. 5,) the ancient people of God, the people of Israel, as an example for their warning; and then afterwards, contrary to the order of times, comes to the examples of the fallen angels (v. 6,) and of Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 7.) In the same manner, Peter, in the parallel passage, 2 Pet. 2: 1, commences with the words: "there were false prophets among the people," and afterwards brings in the example of the fallen angels, and of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah (v. 4 &c). And Peter had a natural inducement, in the context, to make a transition to the false prophets among the people of Israel, because he had immediately before, in 1: 19—21, spoken of the true prophets of the Jewish nation. But on the contrary, in the epistle of Jude, no reason can be discovered for reversing the order of time and commencing with the people of Israel. There is therefore reason to believe, that Jude was led to adopt this order by having his eye on the first epistle of Peter; and not that the latter copied it from the former. The object of Jude's epistle probably was, by a repetition of the admoni-

1 On the subject of the book of Enoch, see Vogel, in Gabler's Theological Journal, for 1803, p. 320 &c. Hug, p. 401 &c. and on the passage Jude v. 14 &c. See Hänlein: Epistola Judæ Graece, commentario critico et annotatione perpetua illustrata. Ed. 2. Erlang. 1805. p. 148 &c.

tions contained in the second epistle of Peter, to impress more deeply upon the readers of that epistle, the dying exhortation of Peter himself, 2 Pet. 1: 14, 15.[1] In the "Commentatio, qua genuina secundæ Petri epistolæ origo defenditur,"[2] and especially in Dahl's Comment. de *ανθεντια* epistolæ II Petri atque Judæ,[3] is a discussion of the evidence arising from a comparison of the parallel passages in second Peter and Jude, and particularly from the greater perspicuity of Jude's language, in favour of the position that the author of Jude's epistle had the second epistle of Peter before him. The contrary opinion is advocated by Hug, in his Introduction.[4]

The epistle of Jude confirms the genuineness of James' epistle. By subjoining to his name (Jude, v. 1.) *αδελφος Ιακωβου*, "the brother of James," he probably intended to call the attention of his readers to the epistle which they had received from his brother James, who was now no more. For since his readers must have known from whom they had received this epistle, it cannot well be supposed that he added these words merely to make himself known to them, or to distinguish himself from others of the same name.—The epistles of James and Jude must have been addressed to the same persons; if both were intended for the readers of the epistles of Peter: vide III and IV, in this illustration.

On the genuineness of the epistle of Jude, the reader may consult Hänlein's Comment. in epistolam Judæ, Sect. I, § 1. and Hug, sup. cit. p. 163 &c. The principal objections against its genuineness are adduced in Dahl's Comment. p. 79—82, and answered in the Tübing. gelehrt. Auzeigen, for 1808. No. 32, p. 254 &c.

---

1 See the dissert. sup. cit. p. 47 &c. 2 P. 18 &c. Tübingen, 1806.
3 Sect. II. p. 25 &c. 4 P. 388 &c.

PART II.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 4.

That the writings, whose genuineness has been proved in § 2, 3, have been transmitted to us without any alteration prejudicial to their integrity; is proved by the exact coincidence of our text with all the transcripts which men have been able to collect of all ages and countries, with the many and large extracts from the New Testament found in the writings of the christian Fathers, with the Commentaries on the books of the New Testament, and finally with the different translations which have been made of the New Testament.(1) The various readings of the New Testament text, are so far from invalidating these proofs, that they actually corroborate them.(2) Nor have we any reason to fear, that some of the books may have reached us only through the medium of a Greek translation, which is materially diverse from the original text. For the hypothesis, that the Gospel of Mark was originally written in Latin, is a figment of later date.(3) The conjecture, that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Hebrew, is indeed ancient, but unfounded.(4) But that *Matthew* wrote his Gospel in *Hebrew*, cannot be denied. (5) Yet the accuracy and the great antiquity of the Greek version of Matthew which we possess, are probable even from internal proofs; (6) and are rendered certain by the exact coincidence of all the transcripts, and all the quotations found in the Fathers, and all the versions of Matthew, with our text.(7)

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Our present text is the same as that which Marcion found in use in the catholic church.

The whole arrangement of Marcion's Gospel, proves that he found in the christian church, no other text than our present one, and that he himself fabricated another. This is also evident from his complaint, that the Gospel which he found in use had been adulterated by the enemies of Judaism, in order to make it harmonize with the law and the prophets: for he does not substantiate his charge, by alleging that another Gospel different from the catholic one existed; but he appeals to a passage in the epistle to the Galatians (chap. II.), which he evidently misunderstood, and interpreted not as guided by the love of truth, but by devotion to his system. Vide § 2. Ill. 8.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The various readings confirm the integrity of our text.

The diversity in the various readings of the New Testament, proves that the copies of the New Testament books which were used by ancient writers, translators and expositors, as well as those used in the present day, were derived from different sources. We have therefore in these various readings, the testimony of a multitude of separate and unconnected witnesses in favour of the substantial correctness of our text: for as to this, all the manuscripts, commentaries, versions and citations are in agreement.

Schmidt, in his Introd. to the New Test. (§ 170—177,) has, by evidence drawn from the history of the ancient controversies between the catholic church and her enemies, put to rest the suspicion that the New Testament text may have suffered much injury during the early ages of the church. The different sources from which the various readings sprung, are stated in the same work, § 181 &c.—On the Integrity of

the New Test. see Kleuker, pt. III. Vol. I. p. 471—495. Hänlein, pt. I. p. 225—240. Schmidt's Introd. pt. II. p. 32 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

We have the Original of Mark, and not merely a translation of it.

It was a vague report that Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, which gave occasion to the erroneous opinion, that his book was intended for Romans, and therefore written in Latin. The Latinisms of Mark can afford no support to this conjecture; as the Romans naturally brought with them many Latin expressions into Syria and Palestine.

Compare the following works, Michaelis' Oriental Bibliothek, pt. 13. p. 109 &c. and Introduction to N. Test. 4th edit. § 143. Hänlein's Introd. to N. Test. pt. I. p. 328—330. Eichhorn's Introd. pt. I. p. 560 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The conjecture that there was a Hebrew original of the epistle to the Hebrews, though ancient, is unfounded.

Clemens of Alexandria is the oldest known writer, who advanced, according to Eusebius,[1] the hypothesis that the epistle to the Hebrews was originally written in Hebrew. But Clemens does not represent this hypothesis as a fact supported by history. On the contrary, it undoubtedly originated from the ungrounded opinion that the style of this epistle is widely different from that of the other writings of Paul. Origen paid not the least respect to this conjecture of his instructor Clemens. But as Clemens adduces the superscription *προς ἑβραιους* (to the Hebrews), as one ground of his supposition; the question arises, whether *ἑβραιοι* (Hebrews) necessarily signifies Jews

[1] Eccl. Hist. VI. 14.

whose vernacular tongue was the Hebrew : for if it does, it affords an argument which is not without some weight.—Yet Paul might have written in Greek, even to Jews who spoke Hebrew. —But, according to the idiom of that day, the word ἑβραιος was not confined to Jews who spake Hebrew, (as Hug has maintained,[1]) but denoted a circumcised Jew, in opposition to ἑλληνιστης. Paul in his second epistle to the Cor. XI, 22, denominates himself ἑβραιος (a Hebrew), although he was a native of Asia Minor ; and he even makes a distinction between ἑβραιος and ισραηλιτης (Israelite) one born a Jew. Indeed Clemens himself[2] extends the signification of the word ἑβραιοι so far as to embrace all who enjoyed the benefits of divine revelation.

Pantaenus, who was the teacher of Clemens, and to whom Clemens appeals,[3] did not probably, infer that this epistle was addressed to Jews in Palestine, from its superscription προς ἑβραιους, but from several misinterpreted passages of the epistle itself, (cap. I. 2. II. 13. XII. 25,) from which he concluded, that the readers of this epistle were such christians as had enjoyed the personal instruction of Christ.

The language of the epistle itself, especially the indefiniteness of certain Greek terms, (such as διαθηκη for covenant, 9: 15,) and the citations from the Old Testament, are evidence in favour of a Greek original. See Heinrich's Prolegomena in epist. ad Hebræos, p. 17. Hänlein's Introduction to New Test. pt. II. No. 2. p. 760 &c. Schmidt's Introd. pt. I. p. 273 &c. Hug, pt. II. p. 308 &c.

---

[1] Introduction, pt. II. p. 33 &c.

[2] Strom. L. I. c. 5.

[3] Euseb. H. E. VI. 14.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Matthew's Gospel originally written in Hebrew.

The following evidence for a Hebrew original of Matthew, is presented in the work on "The Object of the Gospel of John," § 61.

Papias, Irenæus, and Origen, all testify that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Papias uses these words:[1] *Ματθαιος ἑβραιδι διαλεκτῳ τα λογια συνεγραψατο*, i. e. Matthew wrote his gospel in the Hebrew language. This information Papias probably derived from one or the other of his two friends in Palestine, Aristion and John the Presbyter, whom Eusebius denominates (*μαθητας κυριου*) "Disciples of the Lord." Irenaeus, speaking of the four gospels, says: *Ματθαιος εν τοις ἑβραιοις, τῃ ιδιᾳ αυτων διαλεκτῳ γραφην εξηνεγκεν ευαγγελιου* i. e. Matthew, among the Hebrews, wrote a gospel in their own language.[2] He also asserts,[3] that the Ebionites—(whose country was Palestine)—used only the gospel of Matthew. It is not easy to assign a reason why the Jewish Christians of Palestine used only Matthew's gospel, and not also that of Mark, which was published very early and under the authority of Peter the great apostle of the Jews; unless it be admitted, that Matthew's gospel and that only was written in their native tongue. Origen[4] appeals to tradition (*παραδοσις*), for proof that the gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew *ἑβραικοις γραμμασι συντεταγμενον.*

According to the testimony of Eusebius,[5] Pantaenus found the Hebrew gospel of Matthew in India (Arabia Felix), which had been brought thither by the Apostle Bartholomew.

---

[1] Euseb. H. E. III. 39. [2] Euseb. H. E. V. 8.

[3] Adv. Haeres. Lib. I. c. 26. § 2. III. c. 11. § 7.

[4] In Euseb. H. E. VI. 25.

[5] Hist. Eccles. V. 10.

Jerome[1] asserts, that the Gospel of the Nazarenes which he transcribed, was ipsum hebraicum Matthæi, i. e. the Hebrew itself of Matthew. See § 2. Ill. 4.

The Hebrew character of Matthew's autograph is vindicated in the following works, Hänlein's Introduction to N. Test. pt. II. No 2. p. 313—329. Eichhorn's Introd. Part I. p. 461—489. (on the proof derived from the supposed errors of the Greek translation, as discussed in p. 477—489 of Eichhorn's Introd.—see the Remarks of the Reviewer, in the Haller Litt. Zeitung, for 1805, p. 371—377.) Schmidt's Introd. pt. I. p. 30—35. pt. II. preface p. IV—VI. Feilmoser's Introd. to N. T. p. 23—46. Hug, on the contrary, maintains that Matthew was originally written in Greek, Introd. pt. II. p. 16—43. and also Schubert, in his Dissert. critico-exegetica, qua in sermonem, quo evangelium Matthæi conscriptum fuerit, inquiritur. Götting. 1809.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Internal evidence for the integrity of the Gospels.

In our Greek text of Matthew, we may observe a certain regular coincidence with Mark's Gospel, and a uniformity of plan, which would doubtless have been destroyed, if subsequent interpolations or alterations had been made.[2]

By similar internal evidence, the integrity of the Gospels of Mark and John is established. In John's Gospel, the harmonious coincidence of the individual parts with the object of the apostle, (which was to confute the disciples of John the Baptist and the Cerinthians,) speaks for its integrity.[3]—And that Mark's Gospel has reached us unadulterated, is proved by the exact co-

1 De Viris Illust. s. v. Matthaeus.

2 See "On the object of John's gospel," § 67. 64.

3 ibid. p. 221.

incidence of its present text with the plan which Luke drew from it.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Faithfulness of the Greek translator of Matthew.

As our Greek text was the basis of all the versions of Matthew which have come to our knowledge, and as all the Fathers of the church used this text; we are authorised, by the great estimation in which this version was held, to believe that it possessed superior excellence, and was most faithful to the original. John undoubtedly supposed his readers to be familiar with our Greek translation of Matthew.[1]

[1] Compare Hall. Litt. zeit. for. 1810. No. 332.

PART III.

CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 5. *Historical credibility of the narrations contained in the New Testament.*

As the intelligence concerning Jesus and his messengers, which is contained in the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, is (according to § 2. 4.) derived from Matthew, John, Mark and Luke, it must possess the highest degree of credibility. For these witnesses lacked neither the means of knowing the truth, (1) nor motives to communicate it. Matthew and John were apostles and confidents of Jesus: Mark was under the influence of the apostles, especially of Peter;(2) and Luke was an eye-witness of part of the history of the apostle Paul, who was his teacher. Sustaining to him so intimate a relation, he could easily obtain from this apostle information relative to the earlier incidents of his life: he was likewise his companion, during his residence in Palestine, where he had an opportunity to become intimately acquainted with the history of the other apostles and of Jesus.(3)

That the authors of the Gospels and of the Acts of the apostles, did not practise intentional deception; that, on the contrary, they composed their narratives with the utmost historical fidelity; is evident from the general character and appearance of their narrations,(4) as well as from the nature of the incidents which they relate. For these incidents were of such a nature that their truth necessarily must (5) and easily could (6) be investigated. Every false statement, therefore, would have been exposed to public reprehension, if it had been possible to find any such in their books.(7)

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Competence of the witnesses.

That the evangelists had an accurate knowledge of the facts which they relate, may be evinced from the contents of the Gospels themselves; as Töllner has proved, in the work entitled, "A universal proof of the truth of the christian religion."[1] On their qualifications as witnesses of the truth, the reader may consult David Bogue's essay on the Divine authority of the New Testament, translated from the English, by M. Blumhardt, p. 91 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Peter's participation in the composition of Mark's Gospel.

Origen asserts,[2] that information of most undoubted certainty had been handed down to his time, that Mark wrote his Gospel as Peter dictated it to him (ὡς Πετρος ὑφηγησατο αυτῳ). And he says not one word of the singular opinion, which was even then in circulation, that Mark's Gospel contained selections from the sermons of Peter.—It has been already remarked (§ 2. Illust. 5.), that Justin quotes the Gospel of Mark under the title of απομνημονευματα Πετρου,[3] memorabilia of Peter. Doubtless he received an account of Peter's concern with this Gospel, from Palestine, the land of his nativity; and it is probable that Papias[4] derived the same intelligence from the same place; although the statements of the latter have been deformed, probably by the additions of the Ebionites, who were exclusively attached to Matthew's Gospel.—The Gospel of Mark, which was undoubtedly written for Gentile converts, was probably forwarded from Jerusalem by Peter, (whom God first

---

1 § 75—79. 2 Euseb. H. E. VI. 25.

3 Dial. cum Trypho. p. 333. See also Opuscula Academica, Vol. III. p 67 &c. 4 Euseb. H. E. III. 39.

appointed to the ministry of the Gentiles, Acts 15: 7. 14.), to the Christians in Antiochia.[1] Acts 11: 22 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The validity of Luke's testimony.

According to the Acts of the Apostles, 21: 17. 24: 27, Luke resided with Paul at Jerusalem upward of two years. Here probably, he collected those correct accounts, which he tells us in the introduction to his Gospel, 1: 1—4, he possessed. It is certain from Acts 21 : 18, that James, the relative of Jesus, was in Jerusalem at the same time. Now as the Acts of the apostles was published before the expiration of Paul's imprisonment, Acts 28 : 30, and as Luke's Gospel had been published before, Acts 1: 1 &c, the date of the latter must probably be fixed at the time Luke was residing with Paul at Rome. For it is not only certain that Luke did accompany the apostle to Rome, Acts 28: 16, but he must have remained with him there a long time, as it cannot be doubted that Luke the historian is the same to whom allusion is made by Paul, in Coloss. 4 : 14, Philem. 24, and 2 Tim. 4 : 11.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Internal evidence of the credibility of the Gospels.

It is a universally acknowledged fact, that the evangelists narrate with great simplicity,[2] and throughout manifest entire impartiality. Had they been disposed or permitted to interweave fictitious interpolations of their own, they would have presented in a more prominent manner and have attempted to

---

1 See "On the Object of John's Gospel," § 56. 59. and also § 2. Illustration 6 of this work.

2 See Morus: Defensio narrationum novi Testamenti, quoad modum narrandi § 24, in Dissertt. theol. et philol. Vol. I. 147 &c. And Less on Religion, its history, &c. pt. II. p. 754. and Stäudlin's Critique on the christian system of Religion, p. 309, 317 &c.

magnify those accounts which were favourable to the cause of Jesus;[1] and on the contrary, they would have endeavoured to bestow a more favourable aspect on those incidents which could be perverted to the prejudice of Jesus and his apostles. Examples of the latter, are the taunts of the Pharisees, and their demand of Jesus to work miracles, (Matth. 9: 34. 12: 24, 38 &c. 16: 1—4. Mark 8: 11, 12.); his disregard of the popular call for a new miracle; and notwithstanding the growing dissatisfaction, alienating the people still more by directing their attention to blessings of greater importance which he would bestow on them, John 6: 30.[2] Such also was the charge against Jesus of being a glutton, a wine-bibber, and a friend of publicans and sinners, Matth. 11: 19. and various censures and reproaches recorded in John 7: 3—12, 48 &c. 10: 20; and likewise the scenes of Gethsemane, Matth. 26: 37 &c. Peter's denial of his master, Matth. 26: 69 &c. and Christ's reproof of his disciples for inattention to his miracles, Mark 6: 49—52. 8: 14—21. The form of this argument for the credibility of the evangelists, is seen in its proper light, only when we compare the apocryphal Gospels and histories of the apostles, with our genuine books.[3] In regard to the Gospel of John, it is manifest from the whole face of the narrative, that the author was intimately acquainted with the circumstances which he relates, and that he was a man of tried integrity; that he did not aim at acquiring confidence and importance among opposers of the Gospel, who might be expected to scrutinize every thing he said;[4]

---

1 Origen appeals to this impartiality of the evangelists, in his work against Celsus, Book II. § 24. 48. Compare Töllner, sup. cit. § 78. 88. Werenfels opuscula, T. I. p. 90 &c. Less on Religion &c. pt. I. p. 684 &c. pt II. p. 294 &c. and Bengel's Gnomon, on Matthew. 17: 1.

2 Opuscul. Acad. Vol. III. p. 239 &c.

3 Compare Fabricii Codex Apocryph. N. Test. Kleuker on the Apocrypha of the New Test. especially p. 487—508. 1798. and Paulus' Introductionis in N. T. capp. selectt. p. 261 &c.

4 "On the object of John's Gospel," Sect. I. ch. I.

but that he was conscious of having the entire confidence of his readers. In all his writings, and especially in his Gospel, there is a lively sense of the dignity and glory of Jesus, and a tone[1] of confident assurance, which cannot fail to strike the attention of the reader, and which evince his intimate and devout acquaintance with his subject.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The truth of the facts narrated in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, could not fail to be examined.

Between the history of Jesus and other histories, there is a vast difference, as to the necessity there was for ascertaining the truth of the facts related. With regard to the truth of other events, we may, without involving ourselves in any material detriment, admit or reject it. But no one could avow and vindicate his belief in the history of Jesus, and in the authority which this history ascribed to him and his apostles; without renouncing habits deeply rooted in him from his youth, and throwing off prejudices which antiquity had invested with a kind of sanctity; nor, as Pliny[2] himself confesses, without restraining the love of vice and dissipation, and by so doing entailing upon himself the hatred of his relatives, of his countrymen and even of the human race. Of this, Jesus forewarned the professors of his doctrine;[3] and that his predictions were verified, is evinced not only by the Acts of the apostles,[4] but by the letters of Paul, who in addressing the churches,[5] and some too whose af-

---

1 This tone is observable principally in 19: 35. 21: 24. and first epistle I. 1—3. see "On the object of John's Gospel," § 9. 83.

2 Epist. L. X. ep. 97.

3 Matth. 5: 10—12. 10: 21. 34—36. Luke 12: 1—12, 51—53. 14: 25 &c.

4 Acts 4: &c. 28: 22.

5 1 Thess. 2: 2. 14 &c. 2 Thess 1: 4—8. Philip. 1: 29, 30.

fections he knew had become alienated from him,[1] speaks of the sufferings and persecutions of the Christians, as of a truth taught them by their own experience, and universally acknowledged. And this fact is confirmed even by the testimony of pagan writers, who speak of christians in the language of contempt.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 6.

There was every facility for detecting misrepresentations in the Gospel history, if any had existed.

The facts here referred to, were, as we are informed by the New Testament historians,[3] universally known both in Palestine and in the neighbouring countries, but especially at Jerusalem, the capital of the country, with which the Jews of foreign parts had much intercourse, for various purposes and particularly for those connected with their religion. Thus Philo informs us, in his work De legatione ad Caium,[4] that the Jews of Babylon, and those of Proconsular Asia, annually forwarded to Jerusalem a considerable sum of money for offerings. Now when Matthew and Mark and Luke first published their several Gospels, it was perfectly easy for their readers to detect any imposition, or misrepresentations of fact, in regard to events so recent and so well understood. Nor can a doubt arise whether the accounts concerning Jesus were known from the beginning, and publicly talked of:

---

[1] 2 Cor. 11: 23 &c. 1 Cor. 16: 9. Gal. 3: 4. 4: 29. 6: 12, 17. Heb. 10: 32—34.

[2] See the passages adduced in § 1. Ill. 1. of this work.

[3] The passages alluded to are: Matth. 4: 23 &c. 9: 26. 14: 12, 35, 36. 15: 30 &c. 20: 29. 21: 1—11. 28: 15. Mark 3: 7 &c. 5. 24 &c. 6: 14. Luke 6: 17—19. 7: 17. 24: 18—20. John 2: 23. 4: 1, 45. 11: 42, 45 &c. 12: 10—19. ὁ κοσμος οπισω αυτου απηλθεν i. e. the world is gone after him. Ibid. 18: 20 &c. Acts 2: 5. απο παντος ἐθνους των ὑπο τον ουρανον— out of every nation under heaven. Ibid. 10: 36—38.

[4] page 1035 &c. also p. 1023.

for we learn from the book of Acts that the principal incidents of the gospel history, the instructions, the miracles and the resurrection of Jesus, were not only committed to writing, but were made the theme of oral communication.[1] This fact is established by Matthew 26: 13, and by Paul, who asserts it with the utmost assurance, even in epistles addressed to persons hostile in their feelings towards him and disposed to watch for his halting.[2] Moreover, the principal facts in the history of Jesus are so interwoven[3] with the nature and origin of Christianity, that even those among the earlier Christians, who entertained different views of many Christian doctrines, did not suppose they could be called *Christians*, unless they adhered to these fundamental historical truths, and reconciled them with their other opinions. It is very questionable, whether any Gnostic sect denied the incidents of the visible history of Christ. Cerinthus indeed taught that the Aeon Christ abandoned the man Jesus during his sufferings and death; but he admitted that Jesus rose again. The Docetae, Marcion and the Manicheans, according to whose system every thing corporeal belongs to the kingdom of wickedness, unable to deny the facts of Christ's death and resurrection, had recourse to the subterfuge that they were only apparent.[4]

Among those written accounts which have reached us, the Gospel of Matthew at least was at an early date circulated so generally in Palestine, that the multitude of copies to which different additions were made by those who used it, gave rise to

---

1 Acts 2: 22 &c. 13: 24—31. (compare v. 16.) 17: 18, 31. 25: 19. 26: 22, 23, 26, *οὐ γαρ ἐστιν ἐν γωνιᾳ πεπραγμενον τουτο*, for this thing was not done in a corner.

2 1 Cor 15: 3—11. Coloss. 1: 23. Heb 2: 3, 4.

3 1 Tim. 3: 15 &c. In the Christmas Programm on this passage, p. 15 &c. (1788), the writer shows how intimate a connexion the principal facts in the history of Jesus have with the principal doctrines of Christianity (Heb. 11: 6.) and with godliness *ευσεβεια*, the great object of Christianity.

4 See "On the Object of John's Gospel," p. 175—179.

various and discordant editions of that book. And it is easy to comprehend, how various copies of this Gospel might be differently interpolated in Palestine, where there was so much opportunity to obtain both authentic and unauthentic accounts of Jesus. Such an interpolated Gospel of Matthew must the Gospel of the Nazarenes, used by Jerome,[1] have been. And to such interpolated copies of Matthew, Luke doubtless refers (1: 1, 2.), where he says: "Many have undertaken to compose a history of the things which have occurred amongst us, as those delivered them to us, who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." By the words, *διηγησιν* &c. Luke either intended to give the title of those written accounts, or he wished to convey the idea, that the authors of them give the statements of eye-witnesses as their source of information. Yet this will not prove that all these statements were correct; for had Luke regarded those *διηγησεις* as perfectly authentic, he would not (v. 3, 4.) have opposed his own Gospel to them, as being a history of Jesus composed *ακριβως*, with the greatest accuracy.[2] Papias also seems to confirm the idea of various different transcripts of Matthew, when he says:[3] *Ματθαιος ἑβραιδι διαλεκτῳ τα λογια συνεγραφετο· ἡρμηνευσε δ' αυτα, ὡς ἐδυνατο, ἑκαστος*, i. e. Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew tongue; and each one interpreted it as he could. The word *ἡρμηνευσε* may refer partly to the translations from the Hebrew, and partly to additions.

Again, the Gospel of Mark, which seems to have been written the earliest of all, and in Palestine, must have been well

---

1 On the Object of John's Gospel, § 61.

2 Marsh, in his notes and additions to Michaelis' Introd. to the N. T. pt. II. coincides with this explanation. Compare also Ziegler's "Ideas on the origin of the first three Gospels," in Gabler's theol. Journal, vol. I. p. 423 &c. for 1800. Other views of Luke 1: 1—4. are given by Vogel, in Gabler's Journal for select theological literature, p. 43, for 1804, and by Hug, in his Introd. pt. II. p. 99 &c.

3 Euseb. Hist. Eccl. III. 39.

known among foreign Christians both at Antioch and in more remote places, even before the imprisonment of Paul at Rome; as may be inferred from 1 Cor. 7: 10. 2 Cor. 8: 18. That the Gospel of Mark was written before either of the other Gospels, is probable from the following considerations:[1] *first*, the coincidence of Mark with Matthew and Luke, is accounted for just as well by the supposition that the two latter had Mark before them, as by the contrary supposition that Mark availed himself of their Gospels:[2] *secondly*, if Mark wrote his Gospel first, this circumstance will best account for the fact that Matthew and Luke contain so much which is not found in the Gospel of Mark. For both were in possession of a sufficiency of supplementary matter. On the other hand, if Mark had the Gospels of Matthew and Luke before him, it would be unaccountable that he should omit so large a portion of their contents: *thirdly*, Mark contains but little which is not found in Matthew and Luke. And is it probable that he would have composed a new Gospel for the sake of these few supplements, if the Gospels of Matthew and Luke had previously existed?[3] Besides; what part could Peter have had in the composition of Mark's Gospel, if Mark derived nearly the whole of it from Matthew and Luke? or how could it be asserted, that Mark wrote ὡς Πετρος ὑφηγησατο αυτῳ as Peter dictated to him?[4] From all this, it is probable that the earliest Gospel was that of Mark. Again; in favour of the supposition that the Gospel of Mark was written primarily for the

---

1 See Dissert. I. in Libror. N. T. historicorum aliquot locos, p. 62 &c. where these considerations are adduced.

2 See the Christmas Programm, "De fonte evangeliorum Matthaei et Lucae," 1794.

3 See the Christmas Programm, "De fonte &c." p. 5, 6.

4 Compare Notitiae historicae epistolarum Pauli ad Corinthios interpretationi servientes, not. 166. and Tübing. gel. Anzeigen, for 1805. p. 150 &c.

Antiochians, it has been urged :[1] *first*, that the Greeks in Antioch, who were converted by Christians that were natives of Cyprus and Cyrene (Acts 11: 20.), were ἕλληνες (Acts 15: 1.) or uncircumcised; and for such, evidently, was the Gospel of Mark composed. *Secondly*, the deepest interest was felt at Jerusalem, for the Christians at Antioch; and as soon as intelligence of their conversion had reached that place, Barnabas was dispatched to them without delay, Acts, 11: 22. Now the preparation of a Greek biography of Jesus for the new Christians would be perfectly consonant with this solicitude for their prosperity; as would also be the commission of this charge to Mark, who was the nephew of Barnabas, Col. 4: 10. *Thirdly*, the sons of Simon of Cyrene, who are mentioned only in Mark's Gospel (15: 22.), probably were among those Christians of Cyrene, spoken of in Acts 11: 20, [as having come and preached the Lord Jesus at Antioch; and if so, the fact that their father bore the Saviour's cross would have been an interesting circumstance to the Antiochians, and consequently would be peculiarly suitable to be mentioned in a Gospel addressed to them]. *Finally*, that this Gospel was published prior to Paul's imprisonment at Rome, is inferred from 2 Cor. 8: 18, where the apostle speaks of an αδελφος, ὑ ὁ επαινος εν τῳ ευαγγελιῳ δια πασων εκκλησιων,[2] i. e. a brother who has acquired praise through all the churches, by his services in regard to the Gospel. This αδελφος (brother) seems to have been Mark. For although it cannot be clearly proved that ευαγγελιον was at that early period used to denote a biography of Jesus; still the praise which he is said, in general terms, to have acquired by his services in the Gospel, might arise not only from his travels for the extension of Christianity, but also from his historical account of Jesus. Paul, it appears, was not ignorant of Mark's Gospel; at least the

[1] See, "On the Object of John's Gospel," p. 279 &c.

[2] See Notitiae historicae in Epp. ad Corinthios, Not. 166.

passage 1 Cor. 7: 10, which he adduces as a declaration of Christ, is found no where except in Mark 10: 12.[1] This same αδελφος, Paul sent with Titus to Corinth, to collect a contribution for the Christians of Jerusalem; and for such a charge, Mark was peculiarly adapted, being a member of the church at Jerusalem (Acts 12: 12.) and a companion of Barnabas (Acts 15: 39.) who was likewise concerned with this contribution, Gal 2: 1. Nor could Mark, as a pupil of Peter and a member of the church at Jerusalem, fail to possess influence with that portion of the church of Corinth, which was disposed to adhere to the party of the apostles Peter and James, and to which Mark, in company with Titus, was sent by Paul. [From these considerations it appears that Mark was the αδελφος or brother, of whom Paul says, that he had acquired the approbation of all the churches by his services in regard to the Gospel; and that Paul was himself acquainted with Mark's Gospel; and hence it of course follows that his Gospel must have been published, and was open to scrutiny and to detection if it had contained any misrepresentation].

Finally, that the writings of Luke, which were published during the imprisonment of Paul, must necessarily have been early known, not only to Theophilus and his fellow-citizens,[2] but also to the inhabitants of other countries; is proved in the work "On the Object of the Gospel history of John," p. 377. If we suppose Luke's Gospel was written in the commencement

---

1 On the Object of John's Gospel, p. 180.

2 These could not well have been inhabitants of Palestine; for how could Luke, himself a stranger there, have written what is recorded in his Gospel (ch. 1:4.) to a person resident in the very theatre of the transactions he relates? Michaelis in the 3d edition of his Introduction to the N. Test. quotes from a treatise of Theodore Hase, the opinion that Theophilus was a native of Palestine, and had been high priest. And in the 4th ed. (p. 1091.) he was as much disposed to adopt this opinion himself, as he was to treat it as an improbable conjecture in the third (p. 933, 936). But See Eichhorn's Introd. to N. Test. pt. I. p. 593 &c. and Hug's Introd. pt. II. p. 97 &c.

of Paul's imprisonment at Rome, while various other Asiatic Christians beside Luke were attending him, and that some of these returned to Asia during the continuance of the apostle's captivity; this will account satisfactorily for the early promulgation of Luke's Gospel in Asia.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

The truth of the Gospel history must be admitted; for even those whose depravity prompted them to disobey its injunctions, acknowledged its fundamental facts.

The first epistle of Peter, which was universally received as genuine, and those epistles of Paul which were addressed to particular Churches or to their officers,[1] shew, both in their superscriptions and in various particular passages,[2] that the early existence of Christian churches was a well known fact. The Annals of Tacitus also corroborate what is stated in the Acts of the apostles (ch. 2 &c.) in regard to the multitudes of Christians not only in Judea and elsewhere, but even in Rome itself, before and during the reign of the emperor Nero.[3] Hence we must necessarily infer that the facts, of the truth of which every Christian was required to profess his conviction, were actually believed by a great multitude of persons, at a time, when it was an easy thing to investigate their truth, but no easy matter to avow a belief of them; and, consequently, that these facts were not manifestly fictitious and false, but were really attended by evidence which appeared satisfactory on the closest investigation. Nor is it difficult to understand why some, who were acquainted with the facts on which the Christian religion is based, should

---

1 1 Tim. 1: 3. 3: 15. 4: 11 &c. Tit. 1: 5 &c.

2 1 Cor. 1: 2. 7: 17. 11: 16. 14: 33. 16: 1, 8 &c. 19. 2 Cor 8: 1. 11: 28. Gal. 1: 22. 2: 7—10. Rom. 15: 19—27.

3 See Annotationes ad philosophicam Kantii de religione doctrinam, § XIX. (1793,) where it is remarked, that this testimony of Tacitus authorizes the inference that the miracles of Jesus and his apostles must have been historically true.

nevertheless disavow Christianity. For, the fear which led them to conceal their favourable opinion of the cause of Jesus[1], or at least not to venture actually to attach themselves to the Christians,[2] nay, even the hostility which their conduct on some occasions betrayed, can be naturally accounted for, without impairing in the least the truth and indisputable certainty of the history of Jesus. Prejudice and passion, which in Christians nothing but the force of truth could entirely overcome, might have possessed so great an influence[3] with persons of little love for truth, and of a contumacious spirit, as to urge them to dispute even the most indubitable facts. Thus, the inhabitants of his "own country" regarded the doctrines of Jesus with amazement, but were offended at the humility of his origin;[4] the Pharisees said, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day;"[5] and the Sadducees, who denied the resurrection, were displeased that Peter and John should preach Jesus as risen from the dead.[6] Moreover, the truth[7] of these facts was actually acknowledged by many,[8] who were selfish enough[9] to deny the consequences which flowed from them. Such persons did violence[10] to their own conscience; and this,

---

1 See John 12: 42, 43. 3: 2. 7: 13. 9: 21—23.

2 Acts 5: 12, 13. Compare "An address to a female friend, whose faith in the divinity of the Christian religion had become wavering," p. 74 &c.

3 See Ernesti Opuscula philologico-critica, p. 93 &c. ed. Lugd. Bat.

4 Matt. 13: 54 &c. 15: 12 compare v. 11. Luke 20: 19 compare v. 9—18. John 7: 47—52.

5 John 9: 16. 6 Acts 4: 2. 17: 32.

7 John 11: 47, 48 &c. Acts 5: 28. 6: 13 &c.

8 Matthew 27: 42. John 7: 3, 5, 21—26. 9: 16—18. 10: 21. 11: 47 &c. 12: 10, 11. Luke 13: 14, where the ruler of the synagogue acknowledges the miracle wrought by Jesus. Acts 2: 22 *καθως και αυτοι οιδατε*, as you yourselves also know. 4: 7. (comp. 3: 2—8.) 14—16, 21, 22.

9 Matth 11: 16—19.

10 John 15: 22—25. Matth. 11: 20—24.

sometimes with the most impious and unblushing audacity,[1] without any pretext at all; at other times under pretence of some difficulty[2] attending those doctrines of Jesus in support of which miracles had been wrought before their eyes, or they attempted to account for these miraculous events by ascribing them to some cause, which, instead of recommending Christianity, would reflect disgrace and odium upon it.[3] The real cause of the miracles recorded in the gospel history will hereafter be considered, (§ 8. Ill. 8.) all that needs to be proved in this place is, that the facts of the New Testament history are not fictitious, but were actually observed by eye and ear-witnesses, precisely in the manner recorded.

On the credibility of the historical contents of the New Testament, the reader is referred to the following works: Kleuker, vol. III. part II. sect. 1. Hänlein, pt. I. chap. 4. § 2. Hug's Introd. pt. I. p. 83—87. Bogue's Essay on the divine authority of the New Testament, p. 19, 25, 88—102.

---

[1] Luke 16: 11. John 9: 24, 28, 34. 11: 49. and Acts 4: 17, 18, 21. 5: 17 (comp. v. 14—16,) 28: 40. 7: 54, 57 &c. 12: 3 comp. v. 11. 1 Thess. 2: 15.

[2] John 7: 27, 41 &c.

[3] Matt. 9: 34. 12: 24. Acts 2: 13.

§ 6.

Jesus himself professes the divinity of his mission and doctrines.

It is therefore historically true, that the Founder of christianity, who (as Tacitus informs us, Annal. L. XV. c. 44.) was put to death by Pontius Pilate the Procurator, in the reign of Tiberius, did profess to be a divine messenger;(1) and that he neither derived his doctrines from other men, nor discovered them by the powers of his own mind,(2) but received them from God.(3) According to his own declaration, his conscientious reverence for God (John 5: 30. 7: 18. 8: 29, 55.), and most intimate union with him (John 8: 16, 29. 14: 10. 10: 38. 16: 15.), rendered it impossible for him to communicate any thing solely by himself, or without the cooperation of God.(4) It was in virtue of this his constant union with God, that he demanded that all his communications(5) should be received, not as the doctrines of the mere man Jesus, but as the declarations of God (6) himself; and that they should therefore be regarded as perfect truth.(7) Hence he required, that in those things which transcend the limits of human knowledge, we should implicitly believe him upon his own authority; that we should receive his declarations as the testimony of one who had long been most intimately united with God,(8) and who had the most perfect acquaintance(9) (Matt. 11: 27. John 8: 55.) with things divine, and lying beyond the reach of our knowledge. Accordingly, he assured his hearers, that nothing but irreverence for God,(10) which is itself criminal,(11) could prompt them to reject his doctrines; and on the contrary, that every one who believed him, believed God himself.(12) Nor

is there reason to fear, that his apostles and disciples might have misunderstood what he taught concerning his union with God; inasmuch as his pretensions were generally known, and were frequently disputed by his enemies, (Matt. 26: 63, 68. 27: 54. John 19: 7. 5: 18. 6: 41 &c. 10: 33, 36.)

ILLUSTRATIONS.

1. Illustration. The expressions which Jesus used concerning the divinity of his mission, are these: *θεος, ὁ πατηρ απεστειλε*[1]—*επεμψε με* God the Father deputed—sent me, John 8: 42. 6: 29. 17: 3. *απεστειλας εις τον κοσμον* thou didst depute (or send) me as an apostle into the world, John 17: 18, 23. 5: 37 &c. 8: 16, 18. 7: 16, 28: *εγω εληλυθα εν ονοματι του πατρος μου* I am come in my Father's name, John 5: 43; *απ' εμαυτου ουκ εληλυθα, αλλα εστιν αληθινος ὁ πεμψας με* I came not of myself, but he is true who sent me, John, 7: 28.

On the signification of these expressions of Jesus relative to the divinity of his mission and doctrines, and concerning faith in his divine authority; the reader may consult Süskind's historico-exegetical investigation of the question: "In what respect did Jesus assert the divinity of his religious doctrines and practice?" published Tubingen 1802; and the German edition of the two dissertations De sensu, quo suam Jesus doctrinam divinam perhibuerit. P. I. 1798, P. II. 1801. In this work of Süskind, the divinity (in the strict sense of the word,) of the doctrines and mission of Jesus, is proved from the declarations

1 Our blessed Saviour principally uses the words *πεμπω* and *αποστελλω* to express his mission from the Father. The former is a more familiar term, and the latter, from which the word apostle is derived, is a more solemn word. Both have the same general signification: except in a few passages, such as John 10: 36. 17: 18, where the word *αποστελλω* seems to contain an allusion to the apostolic office, which allusion is not perceptible in the English version "sent," which in other respects conveys the true sense of the original. S.

of the Saviour himself; and vindicated against those explanations of the above mentioned passages of John, which would make them teach the divinity of the doctrines of Jesus only in a vague sense. See also the dissertation of the author of this work "On the spirit of christianity," in Flatt's Magazine vol. I. p. 105—110.

NOTE. The hypothesis, which derives the plan and doctrines of Jesus from the Essene school, has lately been advocated by Stäudlin, in his "History of the system of morals taught by Jesus," 1 Part, p. 510 &c. and is defended with every possible argument. The reader is referred to what Bengel has said in opposition to it, in his "Remarks on the attempt to derive christianity from the tenets of the Essenes," in Flatt's Magazine vol. VII. p. 126 &c. See also the Tübinger gelehrt. anzeigen, for 1800, p. 387, and Lünerwald, "On the pretended derivation of christianity from the Essene doctrines," in Henke's Magazine vol. IV. pt. 2, p. 371.

2 Illustration. *Ουτος γραμματα οιδε, μη μεμαθηκως—η εμη διδαχη ουκ εστιν εμη αλλα του πεμψαντος με*[1] how knoweth this man the scriptures, since he is not one of the learned?—my doctrine is not mine, but his who sent me. On this passage, the author has made the following remark:[2] "The phrase *ουκ εστιν εμη*, proves that the contrasted one *εστι του πεμψαντος με*, as well as that in verse 17, *εκ του θεου*, signifies more than merely this: my doctrine is derived from the will of God as discovered by reason; the voice of God in me (the voice of conscience) prompts me to teach; my doctrine flowed from reflexion on the will of God. For on this supposition, the reason and conscience referred to, would be the mere human reason and human conscience of Jesus. But conscience, if left to

[1] John 7: 15, 16.

[2] See Flatt's Magazine, vol. IV. p. 219.

herself, is liable to error, even when the intention is sincere; so that the voice of conscience may be the voice of an erring conscience, and consequently merely the supposed voice of God."

3 Illustration. John 7: 16. 14: 24.

4 Illustration. John 8: 26, 28, 40. 12: 49, 50. 15: 15. 17: 8. Matthew 11: 27.

5 Illustration. John 5: 30. 8: 28. 14: 10. 12: 49.

6 Illustration. John 12: 48—50. compare *ουδεν* v. 30. and *παντα* Matth. 11: 27. John 17: 7.[1] If, in accordance with the will of God, the man Jesus remained unacquainted with any thing (§ 80); on such subjects he did not publish his own (human) views, but acknowledged his ignorance, as in Mark 13: 32. Hence it follows, that even in such cases, he taught nothing which was *his own*, (*εξ ἑαυτου* of himself, John 5: 30. 8: 28. 12: 49), nothing without a commission from the Father, or contrary to his will, John 12: 49. 8: 28. Moreover, the cause of this nescience, was not a limited divine influence, arising from a limited union of the man Jesus with the divinity, (for this was in itself unbounded,) John 3: 34; but it arose from a voluntary restriction, (§ 81. Ill. 4.) by virtue of which, Jesus himself did not wish to know more than the divine omniscience, with which he was most closely united, (§ 76.) chose at that time (§ 80.) to communicate to him (§ 44.)

7 Illustration. John 7: 16. 14: 24. 17: 8, 14. *τα ῥηματα ἁ δεδωκας μοι—ὁ λογος σου* the words which thou gavest me—thy word. In v. 8, 47. comp. v. 43. Thus John the Baptist says of Jesus, *τα ῥηματα του θεου λαλει* he speaketh the words of God, John 3: 34; and Jesus approved his testimony, John 5: 33. Com. Luke 11: 49. Matth. 23: 34.

8 Illustration. John 8: 16, 26, 40, 45—47. John 5: 30. 17: 8. comp. 3: 33. and 34. and § 36.

[1] See Flatt's Magazine vol. I, p. 117. note 4.

9 Illustration. *Ὁ εκ του ουρανου καταβας—ὁ ων παρα του θεου, ἑωρακε τον πατερα—εαν ουν θεωρητε τον υἱον του ανθρωπου αναβαινοντα, ὁπου ην το προτερον—εξηλθον παρα του πατρος—παλιν πορευομαι προς τον πατερα* he who came down from heaven—he who is from God, hath seen the Father—if ye should see the Son of man ascending to where he was before? —I came forth from the Father—again I go to the Father, John 3: 13. 6: 46, 62. 16: 28. comp. 3: 31.

10 Illustration. *Ὁ μη πιστευων, ηδη κεκριται* he that believeth not, is condemned already, John 3, 18.

11 Illustration. This belief on the authority of Jesus, in things which lie beyond human knowledge, is demanded by him in John 3: 11—18, 32.

12 Illustration. John 12: 48, 49. 5: 38, 42—44. 8: 42—47. Luke 10: 16, *ὁ δε εμε αθετων, αθετει τον απεστειλαντα με* he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.

13 Illustration. *Ὁ τον λογον μου ακουων, και πιστευων τῳ πεμψαντι με* he that heareth my doctrine, and believeth him who sent me, John 12: 44. 5: 24. 13: 20. comp. 3: 3 &c. See on this passage the Magazine, vol. VII, p. 67 &c.

§ 7.

Evidence of the truth of the professions and declarations of Jesus concerning himself.

1. FROM HIS CHARACTER AND GENERAL CONDUCT.

Although the declarations of Jesus concerning his union with God, may have been grounded on his own internal and immediate consciousness, which afforded *him* the fullest conviction of their truth;(1) yet the only evidence by which *others* can be convinced of their truth, must be external, or must consist in facts which accord with his professions.(2) And such evidence is not wanting. The general character and conduct of Jesus shield him from the suspicion of having knowingly laid claim to a connexion with God which was fictitious and imaginary; his character entitles his testimony to credence (John 14: 10. 10: 38). So far was he removed from any visionary projects,(3) which might have led him intentionally to feign any particular relation to God, that he rejected those acknowledgments of respect which were obtruded on him:(4) and on the contrary, out of pure love to God (Matth. 26: 63 &c. John 8: 49.) and to the truth which he was commissioned to teach (John 8: 55.), he persevered in asserting uniformly his extraordinary union with God, although it evidently entailed on him the most grievous consequences.(5) Nor did he relinquish these high pretensions, even at a time when he could have promised himself not a single advantage from them, (Matt. 26: 64. Luke 22: 69. 23: 46, 42,) unless he was immovably convinced of their truth, and of the divine approbation of his conduct in avowing them. And how sincere and firm his conviction was of the reality of that extraordinary cooperation of God to

which he laid claim, is evinced by his confident expectation of the successful issue that would crown his purposes, after he should have submitted to a disgraceful death, which seemed according to human calculation (Luke 24: 19—21.) the greatest obstacle to their success.(6) And this expectation, he avowed by the most express and confident assertions,(10) as well as by his actions; in defiance of the unpromising commencement of his work,(7) and the most formidable obstacles to its advancement; in opposition to the tardy improvement and great imbecility of those who were to be the instruments of the propagation of his doctrines after his death;(8) from whose agency he could himself have expected but little, if he had not possessed a firm confidence in the aid of God.(9) For he refused that honour, which he might have obtained by means of popularity and human management, (John 6: 15): he sought neither to procure nor to retain the applause of the multitude,(11) and he did not court the favour of the great.(12) On the contrary, although he was early conscious of the exalted nature of his destination, (Luke 2:46—49), he did not prosecute his wide and comprehensive plan (John 4: 21—23. 10: 16.)(13) with impassioned ardour: nor was he in haste to enter precipitately (Luke 3: 23.) on the duties of his public office, but designedly postponed the execution of the greater part of his plan, till the time subsequent to his death. (14) This moderation in the execution of a plan, with which Jesus professed to believe himself entrusted by God, is diametrically opposed to the character of an enthusiast, who might merely *imagine* himself the subject of the peculiar aid and influence of God. An enthusiast would not indeed have entertained such extensive views,(15) or have

fixed on so comprehensive(16) a plan,(17) and especially while the immediate results were so inconsiderable as those which appeared during the life of Jesus (Matth. 13: 31—33.) Besides, a person of fanatical character would undoubtedly have seized, and by the aid of a glowing fancy have wrought still higher, the popular ideas concerning the Messiah;(18) ideas so grateful to an enthusiastic mind, and so current among the Jews in the days of Jesus,(19) that notwithstanding he frequently and explicitly opposed them,(20) his very disciples could not relinquish them but with the greatest difficulty,(21) and only after the death of him whom they regarded as the Messiah (Luke 20: 25—46)

ILLUSTRATIONS.

1 Illustration. The certainty, with which Jesus believed himself united with God, he expresses in these words *εγω οιδα* I know, John 8: 14. That an immediate and infallible consciousness of the divine agency in the soul of Jesus, was not impossible, is proved by Köppen, in his treatise entitled "The Bible a work of divine wisdom;"[1] by Kleuker, in his "Examination and explanation of the principal evidences for the truth and divine origin of christianity;[2] and by Flatt, in his dissertation entitled "Observationes ad comparandam Kantianam disciplinam cum doctrina Christiana pertinentes."[3] This possibility, which is the sole object of present inquiry, is also admitted by Plank, in his Introduction to the theological sciences;[4] and by Schmid, in his Moral Philosophy.[5]

2 Illustration. John 5: 31, 36. (compare the work "On the object of John's Gospel," p. 199 &c.) John 15: 24.

---

[1] Pt. II. p. 389 &c. 2 ed. 1797–98. p. 416 &c. [2] Pt. II. p. 179 &c.
[3] Note 47. [4] Pt. I. p. 391. [5] 2 ed. p. 102.

3 Illustration. *ὁ ζητων την δοξαν του πεμψαντος αυτον* (in opposition to *ὁ ζητων την δοξαν την ιδιαν*) *αληθης εστι, και αδικια εν αυτῳ ουκ εστι* he that seeketh the glory of him who sent him (in opposition to "he that seeketh his own glory") is true, and falsehood is not in him. John 7: 18.

4 Illustration. John 6: 15. Matth. 16: 20. 17: 9. Luke 12: 13 &c.

5 Illustration. John 5: 18. 6 : 60, 66. 10: 31—33. Matth. 26: 63—66.

6 Illustration. After Jesus had declared that his church should be invincible, he immediately apprised his disciples of the sufferings and death which awaited himself, Matth. 16:18—23. and 21: 37—43. 26: 11—13. He speaks of his death, and likewise of the extension of his gospel over the whole earth, John 3: 14—16. 6: 51. 10: 15, 16. 12: 24, 31, 32. 16: 7, 8. 17 : 19. And in John 8 : 28, he states that only when his enemies should have brought him to the cross (*οταν ὑψωσητε* comp. 12: 33), when his life should be taken away, not by his own hands but by those of his enemies (8: 22), would the progress of his work make it appear more satisfactorily, that he had not been guided by caprice, which would necessarily cease to act at death ; and in general, that he had not been acting for himself merely *αφ' ἑαυτου*, but that it was the cause and the work of God in which he was engaged. Now the plans of God, the murderers of Jesus had not power to defeat ; because he was able to raise Jesus from the dead, and to accomplish his divine predictions relative to his return to the Father (8: 14, 21) with all the important consequences of that return (16 : 7. Matt. 24 : 14 &c. comp. John 8: 24, 50), in a manner which would place the declarations of Jesus, that he acted under immediate divine influence, beyond all doubt. (John 8: 16, 13.)

The value of the argument in support of the claim of Jesus to a divine mission, which is afforded by his voluntary sacrifice

of himself, is shown by Schwartze, in his work On the death of Jesus, Leipsic, 1805, p. 87—107; and in Flatt's Magazine, vol. I. p. 83—87. Compare Flatt's dissertation in vol. XII, entitled, "Lässt sich die Ueberzeugung Jesu von der Gewissheit und moralischen Nothwendigkeit seines frühen Todes aus einem rationalistischen Gesichtspunkt betrachten?"

7 Illustration. John 3: 32. 15: 20 &c. Matth. 11: 16—24. 10: 25.

8 Illustration. Matth. 16: 23. 17: 17. 26: 31—35, 41. Mark 6: 52. 7: 18. 8: 17—21. Luke 18: 34. 24: 11. John 16: 12, (*ετι πολλα εχω λεγειν υμιν, αλλ' ου δυνασθε βασταζειν αρτι* I have still many things to tell you, but ye are not able to bear them yet). John 20: 9, 19, 25.

9 Illustration. Luke 22: 32. John 14: 16, 26. 15: 26. 16: 5—15. 17: 9—17.

10 Illustration. Matth. 13: 31—33. 10: 18. 24: 14. compare Illust. 6.

11 Illustration. John 6: 26, 60, 66. 8: 30 &c. Luke 14: 25 &c.

12 Illustration. Luke 11: 53 &c. (compare v. 39—52). 20: 19 (compare v. 17, 18). Matth. 15: 12—14 (comp. v. 11). 22: 15—22.

13 Illustration. Compare Dissert. III. in Libror. N. Test. aliquot locos, p. 16. (in Opuscula academica, Vol. III. p. 209 &c.) where it is remarked, that in the injunction recorded Mark 10: 12, Jesus had a reference to nations not Jewish.

14 Illustration. Although the plan of Jesus embraced every nation on earth, yet he would not himself commence its accomplishment among the heathen, nor suffer his disciples, when they were first sent out, to go among the heathen or Samaritans. Matth. 10: 5 &c. 15: 24. comp. John 10: 11—15.

15 Illustration. Matth. 15: 37 &c. *ο δε αγρος εστιν ο κοσμος* the field is the world.

16 Illustration. Matth. 13: 30, 39—43, 47—50.

17 Illustration. See Reinhard "On the plan which the founder of the christian religion devised;" 4th ed. 1798.

18 Illustration. Compare Acts 5: 36. and Less, On Religion, Pt. II. p. 539.

19 Illustration. See the Dissertation, De notione regni coelestis, § II. where it is shown from passages of the New Testament, what false and worldly ideas of the Messiah and of his kingdom, were entertained by the Jewish people, at the time of Jesus. Compare Hess' work entitled, "The doctrines, actions and sufferings of our Lord," new edit. 1805. Pt. I. p. 387.

20 Illustration. John 6: 15, 26 &c. where Jesus opposes the carnal views of those who wished to make him king because he had fed them, and at the same time points them to the object of that miracle, and to the spiritual nourishment which they might expect from the Messiah.[1] In Matth. 5: 3—12, Jesus endeavours to rectify the current opinions of the Jews relative to the kingdom of God, by representing the happiness of this kingdom as a heavenly happiness (v. 12), as a union with God, and a likeness to him (v. 8, 9), as a freedom from moral evil (v. 6), as a happiness which does not remove the afflictions of the present life (v. 4, 10, 11), and which can be attained, not by force and by overbearing, but by meekness (v. 5), humility (v. 3), and a pacific disposition (v. 9).[2] Mark 9: 9—13. Luke 9: 43, 44. 14: 25 &c. Matth. 20: 22—28. Luke 19: 11 &c. where Jesus by his parable (v. 12—27) contradicts the opinion, that the solemn appearance of his kingdom was very near, (v. 11). Luke 19: 29—40. comp v. 41—44. Here, by his mournful and affecting lamentation over the impending calamity

1 See Dissertat. III. in Libror. N. Test. histor. aliquot locos, p. 42—46. (in Opusc. academ. Vol. III. p. 239 &c.)

2 See Dissert. I. in Lib. N. Test. historicos, p. 13, 14. (Opusc. acad. Vol. III. p. 12 &c.)

of Jerusalem, Jesus gave an immediate refutation of every false construction, which the Jews in accordance with their prejudices concerning the Messiah, could put upon his entrance into their city.

The reader may consult Hess' Bibliotheca of sacred history, Pt. II. p. 320 &c. Rau, ad illustrandam Evangelistarum de solemni J.C. in urbem Hierosolymarum ingressu. 1798; & Harras, on the last entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. of Bibl. literature, Vol. X. p. 189—242.

21 Illustration. Matth. 16: 22, 23. 20: 21. Luke 9: 45. 18: 34, 31—33. 24: 21.

Note to this §. On the character of Jesus, the reader is referred to Hess' Doctrines, actions and sufferings of our Lord, Pt. II. 1806. p. 196—205. and Bogue's Essay on the divine authority of the New Testament, p. 19 &c.

§ 8.

Evidence of the truth of the professions of Jesus continued.

II. FROM HIS MIRACLES.

But the principal evidence for the divinity of the mission and doctrines of Jesus, is that derived from those deeds of his which are termed miracles(1, 2). As these miracles, whose historical truth(3) has been proved (§ 5), are of such a nature that they could not be produced by human art(4), or be a mere accidental coincidence of events with the wishes and predictions of Jesus(5); they are occular proofs [σημεια] of the fact, that the man Jesus who produced these effects, was not left to himself; but that he was under the influence of a superior Being, and of that very Being(6), to whom he ascribed all his declarations, as well as these actions of his which so manifestly transcended all human power(7).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

On the signification of εργα, miracles.

It cannot be denied that in some passages, *εργα* manifestly signifies miracles. Such passages are Matth. 11 : 2 (compared with v. 3—5) Luke 7: 18 (comp. v. 11—17). John 9: 3, 4 (comp. v. 6, 7). In other passages in which *εργα* occurs, the evidence, though not so clear, yet favours the idea of miracles. Thus in the texts John 14: 11. 10: 37, 38, 25. Both these passages distinguish between believing Jesus on his own word, and believing him for his works' sake, *πιστευειν αυτω* and *πιστευειν δια τα εργα* or *πιστευειν τοις εργοις*. To believe Jesus himself, on his own word, cannot well signify any thing else, than to believe him because he was a credible person, to believe him on account of his wisdom and uprightness, or for the sake of his character. For how could Jesus expect that he should be believed merely on his word, without any regard to his character? Now believing him for the sake of his *works*, must signify something else, than believing him on his word, or for the sake of his character; and therefore the word *εργα* does not refer to his character and general conduct, but rather to his miracles.[1]

Again, the word *εργα* must signify primarily the miracles of Jesus, in the two passages John 5: 36. 15: 24. In reference to the first passage, it is to be remarked, that the whole discourse from verse 17 to 47, was occasioned by a miracle; the healing of "the man who had an infirmity thirty and eight years," on the Sabbath day. And the *μειζονα εργα* greater works, of which Jesus speaks in the context (v. 20), were also extraordinary evidences of his greatness, to be exhibited, as he himself informs us, partly at the day of judgment (v. 22, 27—29), and part-

[1] See the author's Dissertation on Matth. 17: 27, in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. II. note 60.

ly prior to his death (v. 25); they consisted in raising the dead, and of course were miracles. With regard to the second passage, it is evident that Jesus meant such works as were open to the view of all, and such as could not have escaped their knowledge (v. 22, 25).[1] Now the evidence afforded by his miracles in favour of his divine mission, was precisely such as was best calculated to fix their attention (John 9: 30—33. 10: 21. 3: 2), and it therefore rendered the Jews the less excusable. And as the populace had not so good an opportunity to become intimately acquainted with his wisdom and integrity, as his disciples had who were constantly with him; it may be questioned whether Jesus would have required them to acknowledge him as that exalted Messenger of God which he professed to be, merely on account of the excellence of his doctrines and the holiness of his life; unless the suspicions as to the excellence of his doctrines and life, which his professions relative to the exalted dignity of his person would naturally excite, had been met by such (*εργα*) miracles, as were no less extraordinary than his professions concerning the dignity of his person.[2]

Several interpreters suppose *εργα*, in the aforementioned passages of John, to signify the *official acts* and deeds of Jesus as the Messiah. See Morus' Dissertation, qua describitur testimonium Dei Patris de filio suo, ad Johan. 5: 31—47. Nitzsch's Programm: Quantum Christus tribuerit miraculis? Paulus' New Theological Journal, Vol. IX. p. 370, 428. and Eckermann's Theological Contributions, Vol. V. No. 2. p. 76, where we find the following remark: "*εργα* does not signify miracles,

[1] The declaration of Jesus John 15: 24, That he performed before the eyes of the Jews miracles (*εργα*) which no other person had performed (*ἁ ουδεις αλλος εποιησεν*), was perfectly true: for no prophet of the O. T. had performed so many (John 21: 25) and so many beneficent miracles *πολλα καλα εργα* (21: 25), as he did. See the Dissert. sup. cit. in Flatt's Magazine, vol. II. p. 84, 85. note 60.

[2] Comp. sup. cit. p. 82, 83.

but offices of instruction, or teaching men—the proper method of worshipping God, and the conditions on which his favour may be obtained; in order to their improvement and salvation." See also Eichhorn's Bibliotheca of Biblical Literature, Vol. VII, p. 981, where the expression *εργα* is taken to be synonymous in these passages with *διδαχη* (doctrines). The principal argument of these writers is derived from John 14 : 10—12, and is answered in the Dissert. II. in Libr. N. T. historicorum aliquot locos p. 52—54. (Opusc. acad. Vol. III. p. 151 &c.) where it is shown, (1), that Jesus might, with the greatest propriety, say (John 4 : 11), that on account of his miracles, men ought to believe him to be united with God in the most intimate manner; because these very miracles proved the truth of his declaration. (2), that the 12th verse may be thus translated: "whosoever (among you my disciples) believeth in me, shall perform the same miracles which I perform; and he shall do still greater things (*μειζονα*, majores res,) than these miracles; (he shall be more successful than I have been, in bringing men to receive my doctrines).

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Proof that the miracles of Jesus were intended as evidence of his divine mission; and refutation of the contrary opinion of some late writers.

Jesus himself explicitly declared his miracles to be proofs of the divinity of his mission. Thus, to the disciples of John, who came to him with the interrogation, "Art thou he that should come, or shall we expect another," he gave this most unequivocal reply: "*Πορευθεντες απαγγειλατε Ιωαννη ἁ ακουετε και ἁ βλεπετε· τυφλοι αναβλεπουσι,—μη σκανδαλισθη εν εμοι*, go and relate to John the things which ye have heard and seen: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and good news

is brought to the poor; and blessed is he to whom I shall not prove a stumblingblock." See Matth. 11: 3—5. John 14: 11. 10: 25, 37 &c. 11: 42. 15: 4. 9: 3—5. In the Dissert. II. in libros N. T. historicos,[1] it is proved that the miracle of healing one who was born blind, which is related in the last of these texts, and to which Jesus himself attached great importance (v. 3 &c.), had a remarkable reference to his declaration concerning himself, recorded John 8: 12 &c.

The apostles of Jesus also declare, that the establishment of the divinity of his mission and of his personal glory (δοξα)[2], was the object of his miracles. See Acts 2: 22. John 2: 11. Heb. 2: 3, 4. and compare Diss. I. in libros N. T. histor. p. 83 &c.[3] where it is shown, that Jesus and his apostles by no means discountenanced men's believing in him on account of his miracles (John 4 : 48. Mark 8: 11); but that, on the contrary, such faith was recommended not only to the eyewitnesses of the miracles, but also to all who should even read the accounts of them. (John 20: 29—31).

But some deny that Jesus himself declared his miracles to be proofs of his divine mission. This has been done by Eckermann, in a dissertation entitled, "Did Jesus wish miracles and signs to he regarded as proofs of his divine mission?"[4] and in a dissertation in the New Theological Journal,[5] edited by Dr. Paulus, entitled, "Something on the object of the miracles of Jesus." In reply to both these publications, see the dissertation of the author, entitled, "Did Jesus declare his miracles to be proofs of the divinity of his mission?"[6], and the Programm of Dr. Nitzsch: "Quantum Jesus miraculis tribuerit?", publish-

[1] P. 44. (in the Opusc. acad. vol. III. p. 141—145.) [2] John 11: 4.
[3] In the Opusc. Acad. vol. III. p. 85 &c.
[4] Theol. Beitr. vol. V. pt. II. No. I. [5] Vol. IX. p. 355—399. 413—473.
[6] in Flatt's Magazine, pt. IV. No. IV.

ed Wittemberg, 1796. and the "Remarks on the miracles of Jesus," in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. III. p. 20 &c.

The principal objections, to the opinion that Jesus himself declared his miracles to be proofs of the divinity of his mission and doctrine, as well as the replies to these objections, are the following:

I. Those passages, which are regarded as decisive evidence that Jesus himself declared his miracles to be proofs of his divine mission, did not (so says Eckermann[1]) proceed from Jesus and his apostles, but are interpolations of later date, by persons fond of miracles, who added them to the original narratives of the evangelists, and ascribed them to Jesus. This objection has already been refuted in § 2. Ill. 6.

According to the New Theological Journal, however,[2] it is unnecessary to deny the integrity of these passages, for they can easily be so explained as to afford no evidence that the miracles of Jesus referred to the divinity of his mission and doctrine. Thus, with regard to

1. Matth. 11: 2—5. "Jesus does not derive the evidence, from the miraculous character of his actions, but from the circumstance, that they were performed in a manner worthy of the Messiah. John the Baptist certainly did not doubt the Messiahship of Jesus (v. 7),[3] and his disciples believed that Jesus was the Messiah on *his* word; whence then the necessity of evidence drawn from his miracles? Moreover Jesus places a thing which was not miraculous, (πτωχοι ευαγγελιζονται glad tidings are preached to the poor,) in the same connexion with the miracles which had been mentioned immediately before. Probably the circumstance that Jesus appeared to be too tardy in the execution of his plans, excited some solicitude in the

1 Sup. cit. p. 88—164. 2 Vol. IX. p. 413 &c.

3 See Paulus' Comment. pt. I. p. 693 &c. Additions, p. 294. Kuinöl, Comment. in Matthaeum, p. 303.

minds of John the Baptist and his disciples; and hence Jesus refers them, in his reply, to his activity as the Messiah."

Reply to the first objection. (a) The internal dignity with which Jesus acted, was not visible in such a degree as to authorise the belief, that Jesus could have required faith in himself merely on this ground (see III. 1. supra): on the other hand, the miraculous character of his actions must have arrested the attention of all.

(b) John the Baptist may have had reasons enough for wishing that the belief of his disciples in the Messiahship of Jesus, might be confirmed by a more intimate acquaintance with him. John 3: 26. Matt. 9: 14—17.

(c) According to the declaration of Jesus, the πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελιζονται, was itself something miraculous; inasmuch as Jesus had received his doctrines, and his commission to teach, from God himself. Besides, it was a part of the evidence of his divine mission and Messiahship.

(d) Jesus mentions exclusively his wonderful works, and says nothing concerning his other good deeds, which flowed from his godlike disposition: nor does he give even the most remote intimation, that the works which he mentioned, were to be viewed only in reference to their moral excellence.

2. In the passage, John 11: 41, 42, ἱνα πιστευσωσιν ὁτι συ με απεστειλας, Jesus does not appeal, for the divinity of his mission, to the miraculous nature of the raising of Lazarus, but to his resignation to the divine will, which was evinced by his audible prayer.[1]"

Reply. (a) Suppose the prayer of Jesus had not been succeeded by the miracle of Lazarus' resurrection; or that the thing, for which Jesus thanked God before it occurred, had not

[1] New Theological Journal, p. 424—426.

been miraculous; could his mere praying aloud to God, have strengthened the conviction, that he was sent by God?

(b) But Jesus does appeal to the miraculous nature of the resuscitation of Lazarus: for he says to his disciples: "I rejoice, for your sakes, that I was not present, *ἱνα πιστευητε*, i. e. that ye might be confirmed in your conviction, John 11: 15.

Note. The last of these answers, and in some measure also the first, will likewise serve as a refutation of the following paraphrase given by Paulus, of the 42d verse: "On account of the surrounding populace, I foretold the event which now fulfils my wishes, in order that they might be better satisfied that I undertook my mission in obedience to thy will; according to their custom of judging, that the person whose beneficent purposes are successful, must enjoy the favour of God."[1]

3. Matth. 11: 20 &c. "Jesus ascribes the greater guilt to the cities here mentioned, because they disregarded *his calls to repentance*, and not because they were unconvinced of the divinity of his mission by *the miracles* which he performed."[2]

Reply. Jesus most evidently does represent his *miracles* as a very *cogent call* to a moral reformation (v. 21—23.): for by means of his miracles, a different disposition in them towards him, might and would have been produced (v. 19); and thence a moral reformation would have followed.

4. Matth. 9: 2—6, especially v. 6. "The idea which Jesus here intended to convey, is merely this: in order that ye may see, that I am both able, and under obligation, to remove that prejudice so detrimental to convalescence, that diseases are the punishment of sins."

Reply. The phrase *αφιεναι ἁμαρτιας* cannot signify, to declare it a groundless prejudice, that diseases are the punishment

---

1 See Paulus' Commentary on the gospel of John, p. 775.

2 New Theol. Journal, sup. cit. p. 427 &c.

of sins; but it signifies, either *to remit* the punishment of sins, or *to announce* such remission. In the "Observations on Matth. 9: 6, published in the Tubing. Magazine,[1] it is shown that in the 6th verse, Jesus appeals to his miraculous prediction of an extraordinary event, as an evidence of his higher authority, or of a higher (divine) commission.

5. Relative to the passages in John, in which the word *εργα* occurs, see the first illustration of this §.

II. "There are passages in which Jesus expressly declares, that he does not wish the belief in the divinity of his mission, to be founded on miracles."

Reply. If it has been proved, that in the passages cited under objection I, Jesus asserts the contrary of this; then Jesus either contradicts himself, which cannot be supposed; or, among the possible interpretations of these passages, those must be inadmissible, from which such a contradiction would follow.

But these passages can all, without the least violence, be interpreted in such a manner, as by no means to contain the declaration, that Jesus did not wish to rest the belief of his divine mission on miracles.

(a) Matt. 12: 38—42. 16: 1—4. Mark 8: 11, 12. Luke 11: 29, 30. In all these passages, Jesus rejects the demand of him, to work some miracle, *σημειον*. And he pronounces those who desired the miracles, an evil generation *γενεαν πονηραν*. A very natural paraphrase of these texts is this: "How can these persons demand further proof of the divinity of my mission, since they have already shown, by their conduct when they beheld my former miracles (Matth. 9: 34. 12 : 24), that they are not to be convinced by miracles, and therefore not by the new ones which they demand? Their wishes shall not be gratified. So unreasonable are their demands, that no sign

[1] Vol. XVI. p. 158—172.

shall be given them." Although the contrary is asserted in the New Theological Journal,[1] yet Jesus actually does (in Matth. 16 : 2, 3) refer the Pharisees and Sadducees to the miracles which he had already wrought. For the *σημεια των καιρων*, the signs of the times of the Messiah, are doubtless *miracles ;* as miracles are declared to be signs of the times of the Messiah, by Christ himself, Matth. 11: 3—5. In Matth. 12: 40, & Luke 11: 30, he refers his hearers to the then future miracle of his resurrection, principally because that would most sensibly expose their hatred of the truth, a hatred which caused the death of Jesus, and thus gave occasion to this miracle.[2] And in like manner. John 6: 30, Jesus refers the Jews who desired a sign of him, partly to miracles which he *had* wrought (v. 26), and partly to such as were yet future (v. 62), and which would evince the folly of their worldly expectations from the Messiah (v. 26, 31).[3]

(b) John 4: 48.[4] Even if it were admitted, that Jesus intended by these words to convey the idea, that his character alone, independently of his miracles, entitled him to credence ; he would not thereby deny, that his miracles are satisfactory evidence of his divine mission.

But an explication more accordant with the context, is this : "ye will not believe in miracles, until ye have seen them yourselves." Compare Mark 8: 17—21. Matth. 8: 10. The following view of this passage is given in a posthumous disserta-

1 page 395.

2 Compare on this passage, Symbb. ad illustranda graviora quaedam Jesu dicta in evang. Johanneo, auctore C. C. Flatt, Pt. I. not. 14. 1807.

3 See Dissert. I. in libros N. T. historicos, not. 141. Opusc. acad. Vol. III. p. 85 &c.

4 Flatt's Mag. sup. cit. p. 203 &c. Compare the dissert. I, in libror. N. T. historicorum aliquot locos, p. 82—84. Opusc. academ. Vol. III. p. 84 &c.

tion of Seiler, On the remarkable acts of Jesus and his apostles,:[1] "The words of Jesus, Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe, contain not so much a censure of the desire of the Jews to witness miracles, as a condemnation of their disbelief of the power of Jesus to effect cures at a distance from the subject.—The Jews reposed great confidence in the imposition of the hand of a pious person. And it is probable that the nobleman wished Jesus, in like manner, to lay his hand on his child, which was "at the point of death;" for hitherto Jesus had given no example of his power to cure at a distance."

III. "Jesus even *forbid* the publication of his miracles."

Reply. The prohibition of Jesus to promulgate his miracles, was always occasioned by some peculiar circumstances of the time, or of the persons among whom the miracles were performed. He was particularly desirous to avoid having the title Messiah publicly applied to himself, to which his miracles might give occasion, thereby awakening temporal expectations in the minds of the Jews.[2] But, on other occasions, he himself promoted the publication of his miraculous works. Mark 5: 19, 20. Luke 8: 45—47.

IV. "The idea which Jesus had of miracles, according to some of his own declarations, was not of such a nature, as to justify the opinion, that he could have wished to use them as evidence of the divinity of his mission."

1. "Impostors and persons of the basest character, or at least such as were not disciples of Jesus, had, according to the declaration of Jesus himself, the power of performing miracles, Matth. 7 : 22, 23. Mark 9 : 38, 39. Matth. 24 : 25. Mark 13: 22."

---

1 Published by Rosenmüller, Leipsic, 1810. p. 41.

2 Compare Hess' Lehre, Thaten und Schicksale unsers Herrn, neue Aufl. 1806, Zweite Hälfte, p. 450 &c.

Reply. The two former of these passages, refer to miracles which were performed in the name of Jesus, and in honour of him; but it by no means follows, that they were intended as proofs of the christian character of those who wrought them. (See Illust. 3.) The two latter passages relate, not to miracles actually performed, but merely to such as were promised (*δωσουσι*, compare נָתַן Deut. 13 : 2, 4). On one of these texts, (Matth. 24: 24,) Hess remarks: "Jesus does not here give the specific criteria, by which the "wonders" of those false prophets are to be distinguished from genuine miracles. But the nature of their doctrines, which would manifestly possess nothing of a divine character, should secure his followers against the imposing aspect of their wonders."[1] It is an undoubted truth, proved by several passages of holy writ, (such as 2 Thess. 2: 9,) that God does permit wonders to be performed by superhuman wicked beings; but these can always be detected, by the immoral object for which they are wrought.

2. "It is evident that the disciples of Jesus, when they were first sent out with the power of working miracles, entertained many errors." (Matth. 10: 1.)

Reply. God had power to prevent their intermixing their own erroneous opinions with the doctrines which they taught.

V. "Jesus made no use of his miracles, as evidence of his divine mission, in those cases in which it would be most natural that he should do so." Thus:

1. "When the Sanhedrim demanded of him, "By what authority doest thou these things?" referring to his conduct in the temple (Matth. 21: 23); he makes no appeal, as might be expected, to his miracles."

Reply. The demand of the priests was merely this: Who gave you authority to do these things? and not, what evidence

1 Supra cit. p. 407 &c.

of your authority can you produce? But even to the first inquiry, no direct reply was necessary; for he had just before declared himself to be the highest messenger of God (v. 15, 16), and had confirmed his declaration by miracles (v. 14, 15. John 11: 41—48). Still he does reply indirectly, to the question urged; inasmuch as he persists in accusing his enemies of obstinate disobedience to the will of God, notwithstanding all their ostentation of reverence for the supreme being.

2. "Thus also, in John 7 : 12, compared with v. 20, 25, there was the most urgent necessity for an appeal to his miracles, as the decisive evidence of the divinity of his mission; but there is no appeal made to them in the course of his whole address v. 16—29."

Reply. The question advanced in the 15th verse, Jesus answers in the 16th, and adds the declaration, that he derived his doctrines from God. But there was no necessity for his offering proof of the truth of this declaration; because proof had not been called for; and because at this same feast, he had explained himself fully concerning the proofs of his divine mission, on the occasion of healing a person on the Sabbath day (chap. 5), and to this transaction he refers explicitly in the present discourse (v. 22, 23).

The sense of the passage John 7 : 17, is by no means this: "whosoever doth the will of God, shall be able to discover, from the excellence and truth of the doctrines of Jesus, whether they are of divine origin or not." Jesus only states the subjective condition, on which a conviction of the divinity of his doctrines may be obtained, by attending to the evidences which he points out, among which are his miracles.[1]

It may be remarked generally, in reply to this 5th objec-

[1] See Dissert. on the spirit of christianity, in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. I. p. 107—109, note 1.

tion, that the argument, drawn from the mere silence of Jesus, is very unsatisfactory. It is sufficient, that the Evangelists state some general declarations of Jesus, concerning the evidence of his miracles; there was no necessity for their being often repeated, either by Jesus or by his evangelists.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The accounts of the miracles of Jesus, are not allegorical narratives, but a record of facts.

The truth of this position is clearly evinced, not only by the character of the narrative itself,[1] but principally from the circumstance, that those miracles are, in other passages, presupposed as historical facts (see Matth. 11 : 20 — 23. 27 : 42. Mark 6: 14, 52. 8: 19, 20. 9: 28. John 4: 45, 54. 6: 26. 10: 21. 11: 47. 12: 1, 9—11. Acts 2: 22). Nay, even those who labour to transform the miracles of Jesus into allegories, admit that, at least some of them were real facts;[2] though they assume, that these miracles were the product of human ingenuity; an assumption wholly gratuitous, as shall be proved in the sequel. If, as Damm supposes, the diseases which Jesus cured, were diseases of the soul; how could these cures expose him to the imputation of profaning the Sabbath?[3] But does not the fluctuation of the interpretation given to these passages, which are explained sometimes literally, and sometimes allegorically,[4] naturally excite a suspicion as to the correctness of such a mode of interpretation? Is it not in the highest degree

1 Vide Less, über die Religion &c. Th. II. S. 281 &c.

2 See Damm vom Historichen Glauben, Th. II. S. 48, 52.

3 Matth. 12: 10 &c. Luke 13: 14—17. 14 : 1—3. John 5: 9—18. 7: 21—23.

4 See p. 68. and also p. 23 &c. of Damm, sup. cit.

arbitrary, to interpret some narratives of miracles, as mere allegories,[1] although they present not a single characteristic by which they are distinguishable from others which are admitted to be literal narratives of facts? Damm[2] himself at last admits, that the Evangelists intended by their narratives, to convey the idea, that Jesus actually did, like Moses, perform miracles, in order the more easily to convince the Jews, of his Messiahship. But the moment the advocates of this hypothesis admit, that the Evangelists intended their narrative of miracles *should be understood* as a narrative of facts, their hypothesis necessarily falls to the ground. For it must be readily admitted, that if no real miracle had been performed, the disciples of Jesus, so far from convincing the Jews of the truth and divinity of Christ's doctrines by their account of his miracles, could not have persuaded any one to embrace christianity; on the contrary, they would have crushed their own cause in its birth, if on examination it was evident to all, that the Evangelists had either avoided mentioning the natural means, by which those wonders had been effected, or, that they had intentionally framed their allegorical tales in a manner to delude their readers into the false opinion that they were accounts of real miracles (compare § 5. Illust. 7 supra).[3]

---

1 Ibid. p. 52. 2 Ibid. p. 9, 47—49, 52, 58.

3 In many of the cures performed by Jesus, it would be unreasonable even to think of the use of natural means. Such are those recorded in John 4: 50—53. Luke 7: 6—9. Mark 7: 30. See the Programma of Seiler, 1795: "An Christus in operibus suis mirabilibus efficiendis, arcanis usus est remediis?" That the use which Jesus made of natural means in some few of his cures, is no evidence against his miracles, is proved by Hess, in his "Lehre, Thaten und Schicksale Jesu," Pt. II. p. 396 &c. 454. and by Krummacher, in his work "On the spirit and form of the Gospel history, § 96. Leipsic, 1805. See also Seiler, sup. cit. 47 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Further evidence of the truth of the miracles of Jesus: they were not the product of human ingenuity.

In attempting to account for the miracles of Jesus, it would be unwarranted to attribute them to the use of ingenious machinery and other means of delusion; such as are presupposed by the hypothesis,[1] "that Christ learned the art of working miracles from some mystagogues, but having the impression that they could not be performed without a peculiar influence of God, he declared them to be the works of God himself." For these miracles were by no means confined to one specific *mode* of operation, but were of very different kinds. (1) Jesus cured all kinds of diseases, (*θεραπευων πασαν νοσον και πασαν μαλακιαν,—ποικιλαις νοσοις και βασανοις συνεχομενους*), Matth. 4: 23, 24. 11: 4, 5. (2) He raised the dead, Mark 5 : 35 &c. John 14: 21.[2] Luke 7: 11—17. (3) He fed thousands in a miraculous manner, John 6: 15—25. Matth. 14: 15—21. 15: 32—38. (4) He walked on the sea, Matth. 14: 25.[3] (5) He controlled the winds and waves, Mark 4: 35—39.[4] (6) He procured for Peter an extraordinary draught of fishes, Luke 5: 4—7. (7) He procured for Peter a stater from the fish's mouth, Matt. 17: 27.[5] (8) He displayed an acquaintance with

---

1 Eckermann's "Theol. Contributions," Vol. III. No. 2. p. 179 &c. Compare Flatt's Magaz. No. I. p. 93.

2 Compare the dissertation, "In vindication of the miracle of raising Lazarus," in the Tubingen Mag. No. 14. p. 91 &c. and the works there quoted.

3 See dissert. III. in Libros N. Test. historicos, p. 88. Opuscula acad. Vol. III. p. 286 &c. Hess' Lehre, Thaten und Schicksale Jesu 2te Hälfte. p. 426 &c.

4 See Hess sup. cit. S. 426.

5 Compare the dissertation of the author on this passage, in Tub. Mag. St. 2. S. 56—89.

future contingencies, John 1: 49, 50. 4: 17—19, 29. (9) He converted water into wine, John 2: 1—11.[1] Again, in the performance of his miracles, he was not confined to any particular *place*, which might afford him facilities for deception; but Jerusalem, the temple, entire Galilee, the most remote towns and villages, all witnessed the displays of his miraculous power; and some diseased persons, he healed even without seeing them.[2] Moreover, in all his proceedings, Jesus acted under the constant inspection[3] of men of acute discernment, his bitter enemies, and who scrutinised[4] his conduct with the greatest attention. In the person of Judas, he was attended by a constant spy,[5] whose observation, no apparatus, even of the most secret nature, could have escaped.[6] Yet who can doubt, that if Judas had known, or even suspected, the miracles of Jesus to be mere delusions, he would have felt less poignancy of regret for having betrayed him?[7] And, by the discovery of an imposture, had any existed, he would have rendered to the Jews a very acceptable service, and have secured no inconsiderable advantages to himself.[8]

Nay, miracles were performed on the authority of Jesus, and in reliance on him, by some persons,[9] who, though they re-

---

1 Comp. Mag. St. 14. S. 73—91.

2 See John 2: 23. 4: 45. Matth. 21: 14. 4: 23. 9: 35. Mark 6: 56. John 4: 50 &c. Matth. 8: 8—13.

3 Matth. 9: 3—8, 34. 21: 14, 15. Luke 6: 7—11. 13: 10—17. 14: 1—6. John 11: 46. 6: 22—26, 42—66. 18: 6.

4 John 5: 10 &c. 9: 13 &c. 11: 47. Matth. 8: 4.

5 John 6: 70. 13: 18. 6 Matth. 10: 14, 8. Mark 6: 13: 30.

7 Matth. 27: 3, 5.

8 John 11: 47 &c. 12: 19. Matth. 26: 59, 60, 15. Compare Less über die religion. II Band, S. 304—309.

9 Mark 9: 38, 39. Matth. 12: 27. comp. 7: 22. 1 Cor. 13: 2.

garded him as a divine messenger of an exalted character, yet had no thought of conforming their life and conduct to the precepts which he taught, and who did not ever attach themselves to his followers, but remained among the Pharisees. Nor is it strange, that God should permit them to succeed in such attempts; for the cause of Jesus could not fail to derive great advantage from them; and the slanders of his enemies were repelled in the most convincing manner, by the fact that even the very friends of the slanderers could not, in consequence of their own experience, justify their accusations.[1] Moreover, by what kind of ingenious deception, could Jesus, when he was dead,[2] have been restored to life? For, that he actually did arise from the dead,[7] is placed beyond all doubt, by the testimony of the various witnesses with whom, as the Acts of the apostles informs us, he had frequent and various intercourse[3] after his resurrection; besides, it would be impossible to account, in a rational manner, for the report and belief of his resurrection, the existence of which report is admitted,[4] unless on the supposition that the report itself was true. Indeed the disciples of Jesus, who were witnesses of his resurrection,[5] required some strong evidence of the successful issue of their cause, in order to inspire them anew with confidence and courage; for they had been greatly depressed[6] by the execution of their teacher, and were not prepared to expect any miracle,[7] and least of all, the miracle of his resurrection.[8] Moreover, we cannot con-

---

1 Mark 9: 39. Matth. 12: 27. 2 John 19: 33. Mark 15: 44 &c.

3 1 Cor. 15: 5—7. Acts 1: 3. 10: 40. 13: 31.

4 1 Cor. 15: 11, 12. Acts 2: 32. 3: 15. 4: 2, 33. Comp. § 5. Ill. 6.

5 Acts 1: 22. 6 Luke 24: 20. John 20: 19, 26.

7 John 6: 5—9. Mark 6: 51, 52. 8: 17—21.

8 On the historical truth of the resurrection of Jesus, see Paulus' Commentary, Pt. III. p. 842—852.

ceive how the apostles could have wrought the many miracles of a public nature,[1] which they did,[2] by the authority and power of the risen Jesus, that illustrious worker of miracles, and the truth of which miracles, even their enemies were unable to deny,[3] if we suppose that they were left to their own strength, and consequently were either enthusiasts or impostors. We are, therefore, constrained to yield our assent to the account which they themselves give, that God himself had bestowed on them the power of working miracles; in order that they might be able to give their hearers ocular proof of the truth of the resurrection of Jesus;[4] and in order to convince their hearers that it was in obedience to the will of God,[5] that they published the illustrious fact, of which they were themselves witnesses, having seen him alive,[6] and the promulgation of which, his enemies would not tolerate.[7] Even the enemies of Jesus were unable to suppress[8] the fact of his resurrection, which was so hateful in their sight;[9] nay, so improbable did they consider the falsehood which they themselves had fabricated, that they did not even attempt to convict the disciples of Jesus, of misstating facts, but in the trial resorted to every other subterfuge.[10] And they did not even dare to institute an examination of the watchmen, to whose custody the grave of Jesus had been committed:[11] al-

---

1 Acts 2: 43. 5: 12, 15. 2 Acts 3: 6, 16. 4: 7, 10, 30.

3 Acts 4: 14, 16, 21. 5: 17, 18, 16. 4 Acts 5: 30, 32.

5 Acts 4: 19. 5: 29, 32.

6 Acts 10: 40—42. 4: 20. Compare the Programm on 1 Tim. 3: 16, (published in 1788), p. 14 &c. where the words ωφθη αγγελοις, [in the authorised version, "seen of angels"], are explained as referring to the disciples of Christ to whom he appeared.

7 Acts 4: 17 &c. 5: 28. 8 Matth. 28: 11 &c.

9 Acts 4: 1—43, 18. 5: 17—50. Compare Matth. 27: 64.

10 Acts 4: 17, 18, 21. 5: 27 &c. 33, 40. Compare Seiler, sup. cit. p. 26.

11 Matth. 28: 14.

though such an examination would have been the most certain method of effecting the total overthrow of christianity, if they could have established the charge of imposture, which they had alleged against the apostles.[1] And if christianity *could* have been clearly proved an imposition, would it not be absurd to suppose that any person should persist in defending it, at the expense of so many sacrifices? Now, as such multitudes were ready to profess their friendship for the christian cause, and to advocate its interests against every enemy (see § 5. Illust. 7); it must necessarily follow, that the charge of imposture can not be established.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The miracles of Jesus were not the result of mere coincidence of circumstances with his wishes and predictions.

This is evident from Matth. 8: 3, 8, 9, 12. Mark 7: 34 &c. Luke 7: 14 &c. 18: 42 &c. John 4: 50—53. 11: 41—44. in which passages, we have account of the cleansing of a leper, the cure of the centurion's servant, and that of the man deaf and dumb, the raising of a widow's son from the dead at Nain, the restoring of sight to the blind beggar near Jericho, the cure of the nobleman's son at Capernaum, and the resus-

1 The later objections against the historical truth of the statement of the watchmen at the grave of Jesus, which are urged in Paulus' Meletemata ad historiam dogmatis de resurrectione, 1796 (compare Comment. über das N.T. Th. III. S.853 ff.), are refuted in the following works: N. allge. deutsche Bibliothek, Band 29. S. 424 f. Tobler's Theolog. Aufsütze, Zürich, 1796. S. 175 ff. Tüb. Mag. St. 9. S. 156—219 (the influence of the narrative of the watchmen at the grave of Jesus, on the truth of his resurrection). Compare also Hess' Lehre, Thaten und Schicksale unseres Herrn, Th. II. S. 531 ff.

2 See "Address to a female friend, the firmness of whose conviction of the truth of christianity, began to be impaired," p. 65—71. and Ditton's work entitled, "The truth of the christian religion proved from the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (translated into German, 1734, Brunswick), Pt. III. ch. 4—9. and Paley's Examination of the Evidence of the truth of christianity, p. 424 &c.

citation of Lazarus. Those miracles also which Jesus wrought without giving notice of his intention to perform them (such as those of Luke 8: 43 &c. 6: 19. See also Acts 5: 15. 19: 12), were nevertheless dependant on his will; inasmuch as the confirmation of his divine mission, to which he continually laid claim, and to substantiate which he wrought all his other miracles, was the great object for which God accomplished the miraculous cure of those diseased persons. And besides, those persons who sought relief from Jesus, were led to expect it, by the miracles which he had before voluntarily wrought; and their hope was evidently grounded on the declaration, which Jesus had so often made and confirmed by miracles, that he acted under the influence of divine power, and that he was the individual whom God wished exclusively to exhibit as his greatest messenger. Now, as the expectation of the diseased was realized, God himself justified that expectation by the miracle, and thereby confirmed the declaration of Jesus on which it was founded, namely, that he was in intimate union with God. The confidence, which these persons reposed in Jesus as a distinguished messenger of God, was coincident with and justified the expectation which Jesus himself frequently expressed, that every necessary evidence would be given to substantiate the divinity of his mission. Moreover, Jesus himself occasionally stated, that the restoration of those who merely touched him, was in accordance with his will, Mark 6: 56. And if we suppose, that in some cases, when Jesus was not thinking of a miracle, God wrought a miracle, in order to satisfy expectations which Jesus had aimed to excite by his doctrines and miracles; this would only prove, the more demonstrably, that the object of God accorded perfectly with the purpose of Jesus, which was, to establish the divinity of his mission.[1]

[1] See Michaelis' Anmerkung zu Ap. Gesch. XIX. 12.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

The miracles of Jesus are therefore conclusive evidence, that he acted under the influence of God.

See the following passages: John 11: 11—15. Matth. 27: 63. Luke 24: 6, 7.[1] 9: 1, 2, 6, 10. 10: 9, 17. John 14: 12. If Jesus had performed *only one* miracle which accorded with his wish and prediction, this might be ascribed to accident. But the very possibility of this being the uniform fact, is precluded by the great *multitude* of his miracles recorded in Scripture, of some of which only a general statement is made,[2] as well as by the *nature* of his miraculous acts.[3] And this evidence receives additional strength, from a consideration of the particular reference which the miracles of Jesus had to the doctrines of Jesus, who appealed to those miracles for the divinity of his mission.[4] These miracles are therefore demonstrations of the exalted nature (the divinity[5]) of Jesus, which the Gospel asserts, and of his destination to be the redeemer of men from the consequences of their sin, John 10: 32, *καλα εργα* beneficent miracles. Acts 10: 38, *διηλθεν ευεργετων* he went about doing good. Matth. 9: 5 &c. 8: 17 (from Is. 53: 4), *αυτος*

---

1 See Süskind's "Dissertation on the predictions of Jesus relative to his own resurrection;" and "Remarks on the question, Did Jesus distinctly predict his resurrection?" in Flatt's Mag. Vol. 7. p. 181—226. and also C. C. Flatt, Symbb. ad illustranda graviora quaedam Jesu dicta in Evangelio Johanneo, Pt. I. p. 1—8. Pt. II. p. 17—20, 26.

2 Matth. 15: 30, 31. Mark 1: 34. 3: 7—11. 6: 13, 54—56. Luke 6: 17—19. 7: 21. John 20: 30.

3 See Flatt's Beitrage zur christ. Dog. und Moral, p. 33 &c. 1792. and the author's dissertation, "Did Jesus declare his miracles to be a proof of his divine mission?" in Flatt's Magazine, Vol. IV. p. 182—186. and Bogue's Essay on the divine authority of the New Test. p. 130 &c.

4 John 5: 36, 37. 10: 25, 37 &c. 14: 11. 15: 24. Matth. 11: 3—5. John 2: 18—22. Comp. Matth. 26: 61. 27: 40. Compare III. 2.

5 John 11: 4, 13—25. 5: 20, 25. 1: 14, 51, 52. 2: 11, (*εφανερωσε την δοξαν αυτου* [displayed his glory] vide Mag. vol. 14, p. 79 &c.) Matth. 8: 27. Acts 3: 6, 12, 13, compare 2 Pet. 1: 16—18.

τας ασθενειας ἡμων ελαβε, και τας νοσους εβαστασεν, he hath himself taken away our infirmities, and borne our diseases.

In the passage of Isaiah, the removal of the *punishment* of our sins, by the death of Jesus, is the subject of discussion; but the punishments of sin are represented figuratively, as diseases and pains, in order also to remind us of the miraculous cures of Christ; because it was by the cure of bodily diseases and pains, by a miraculous power, that the Messiah was to prove that he had come into the world for the purpose of removing the consequences of sin.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 7.

God must have been, ultimately, the author of the miracles of Jesus, even if he acted through the instrumentality of a superior angel.

If it must be admitted that Jesus was aided by a superhuman being, then the main point on which the truth of his declarations depends, and which alone could be involved in doubt, is cleared of all difficulty. For it can now no longer be doubtful, who the being was, by whom Jesus was enabled to produce those effects; whether that aid was afforded by means of a particular constitution of the powers of nature in the original creation, or, as is far more probable,[2] by an immediate influence on nature itself, at the time when those miracles were wrought.

---

1 See the Dissertation on the object of the death of Jesus, in the Comment. on the Hebrews, p. 481 &c. John 5 : 24 &c. 11 : 23—26. He that shall raise the dead at the latter day, has raised some even in this life, 1 Cor 15: 20—26. Matth. 12: 28. Compare § 51. See on this subject, Hess, über die Lehren, Thaten und Schicksale unseres Herrn, S. 368 &c. Geschichte der drey letzten Lebensjahre, Band 2. Einleit. S. XXVII. and Köppen's "The Bible the Product of Divine Wisdom," Pt. 2. p. 234 &c.

2 Compare § 36. Ill. 1. and the author's dissert. on Matth. 17 : 27, in Flatt's Mag. vol. 2. p. 57—62. particularly note 11. and Seiler, On the remarkable acts of Jesus and the Apostles, p. 72—84.

No reason can be assigned, why the Being, under whose influence Jesus acted, should not have been that being (God) which Jesus himself stated. Certainly no one had a better opportunity to know who the being was, than Jesus, who was supported by him in a supernatural manner, who was in intimate union with him, and therefore had a better opportunity to know him, than any other could have. And should any one be disposed to adopt the gratuitous and arbitrary assumption, that the author of the miracles and doctrines of Jesus, was some other being than God himself; that being could, at least, not have been an evil spirit, an enemy to God and man. Even the very nature of those miracles,[1] and of the doctrines[2] which were substantiated by them, forbids such a supposition: for those doctrines, whether true or not, confessedly breathe a spirit of reverence to God, and would, even by the confession of our enemies,[3] secure to christians, the most important advantages, if they entertained a higher regard for them. Now, an evil spirit would have endeavoured to promote the cause of wickedness;[4] and, though arrayed in the garb of an angel of light,[5] would have betrayed his real character, by the prosecution of such plans as are congenial to his nature. A good spirit, on the other hand, being filled with reverence for God, would never have lent his aid to Jesus, unless God commanded him to do it; and he certainly would not have urged Jesus to assert a falsehood in the name of God (1 Cor. 15 : 15), and falsely to profess that God

---

1 Matth. 12 : 24 — 29. Acts 10 : 38. Comp. Hess, "On the doctrines and acts of our Lord," p. 365 &c. (new edit. 2d pt. p. 390).

2 Compare Tübing. Mag. No. 1. p. 96, 97, 98. No. 2. p. 163—191.

3 2 Thess. 2: 9—11. v. 4. Rev. 13: 2, 4, 6, 13.

4 On the possibility and credibility of miracles, compare the Tüb. Mag. No. 1. p. 90. No. 3. Pt. II. No. 8. p. 152. Gräffe, de miraculorum natura philosophiae principiis non contradicente. Helmstadt, 1797. and the same author's "Philosophical vindication of the miracles of Jesus and his apostles."

5 2 Cor. 11: 14, 3. Comp. Gen. 3: 5.

was the author of his miracles and doctrines, when, in fact, he was not acting by divine authority, but on the authority and by the aid of merely a spirit of higher rank.

If we suppose that higher spirit acting by the command of God, enabled Jesus to perform his miracles; it will then follow, that in communicating his doctrines, Jesus acted in accordance with the will of that God, by whose command the angel enabled him to perform works far transcending the powers of human nature, in order to confirm the divine origin of those doctrines.

It cannot be supposed, that if God wished to instruct the children of men through the medium of a superior spirit, he would select a spirit who was not qualified for the undertaking. (Compare § 36. Illust. 3, infra.) It would be superfluous, in this place, to enter inter into an investigation of the *possibility* of miracles, as we are compelled by the constitution of our nature, to admit as possible, that which is demonstrated by facts.[1]

Finally, Jesus himself expressly ascribes his miracles to God; John 9: 3. 11: 41, 42. 4: 40. 14: 10. 5: 19, 20, 36. 10: 25, 32, 37. 6: 27. And the apostles of Jesus, in like manner, attribute his miracles to the same power; Acts 2: 22. 10: 38. 1 John 5 : 9, *μαρτυρια θεου* is the testimony which God bore concerning Jesus, by so many miracles.

---

1 Compare "Annotationes ad philosophicam Kantii de religione doctrinam, § 35. p. 70. and in the German translation Tüb. 1794. p. 95. Jung, in his "Urania for the head and the heart," edited by Ewald, 1793. Vol. IV. No. 1. p. 258—289. Fichte's Critique on Revelation, § 7. Stäudlin's Critical Essay on the christian system of religion, § 48. Critical estimate of the protestant doctrinal system, according to the principles of religious criticism, 1st supplement, p. 12. The arguments by which the author of the last mentioned work endeavours to prove that we can never be convinced of the truth of miracles, are refuted in Flatt's Beitrage zur Dogmatic und Moral, S. 60 &c. h.

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

For abundant evidence that the credibility of the miracles of Jesus, is not in the least impaired by comparison with any modern pretended miracles, the reader is referred to the work of Dr. Less, "über die Religion," Pt. 2. p. 214 &c. Jacobi's Dissertations on important points of religion, No. II, XVII, XX, Pt. 1. p. 25 &c. Pt. 3. p. 185. Pt. 4. p. 287. 2nd ed. Paley's Evidences of the Christian Religion, p. 247. Lüderwald's work entitled, "Antihierocles; or the great difference between Jesus Christ and Apollonius of Tyana," Halle, 1793. and Herder's Letters on the study of divinity, letter 34th.

On the evidence of the divinity of the doctrines of Jesus, derived from his miracles, see Plank's Introduction to the Theological Sciences, Pt. 1. Apologet. ch. 3. Seiler's "Reasonableness of a belief in the christian religion, established by arguments drawn from history and common sense," § 1—3. 1795. Compare the work, "On the nature, objects, and effects of the miraculous deeds of Jesus and his apostles, Leipsic, 1810. Vogel's Essays on theological subjects, Pt. 1, 1796. Bogue's Essay on the divine authority of the New Testament, translated from the English, by M. Blumhardt, Basel, 1808. p. 126—139.

§ 9.

The divine authority of the doctrines of the apostles.

The Lord Jesus, whose words were all uttered under divine influence (§ 6, 7, 8), commissioned all the apostles whom he had chosen(1), with the single exception of Judas, the traitor(2), to promulgate and propagate (3) those doctrines which he had himself taught. From their discharge of this commission, he anticipated the happiest results(4); not only because the apostles had been his companions(5), and had been instructed in his doctrines, and had been eyewitnesses of his miracles(6), but because he depended principally on the agency of God (John 17: 11—15), who would, by various aid, supply the absence of Jesus who had hitherto been their friend and instructor; and in his stead, give them another supporter, who would never abandon them, John 14: 16, 17, and would perfectly qualify them for the discharge of their official duties, Acts 1: 8. Luke 24: 48, 49. Thus, the personal agency of the apostles was by no means dispensed with, in the performance of their duties(7); but they were required to combine (John 15: 26, 27) those instructions which should be given them by their constant and exalted guide, with what their own knowledge and ability supplied. Jesus assured them, that the "Spirit of truth," το πνευμα της αληθειας, John 14: 17, who perfectly coincided with him and his Father (8), would bring to their recollection, all those words of his which they might have forgotten, as often as such recollection should be necessary to the discharge of their official duties(9); that he would correct their knowledge of the things they had imperfectly comprehended, and

would communicate(10) to them, all necessary knowledge, not(11) excepting a knowledge of future and secret things, which they could not obtain(12) by natural means. And hence it follows, that when in some of their communications, their invisible and constant instructor, ὁ παραχλητος(13), brought nothing to their recollection, but left them to use their natural ability and knowledge; those communications were really sanctioned by the Spirit of truth. According to the certain declaration of Jesus, therefore, we are to view all the doctrines of his apostles as the doctrines of that Spirit of truth(14), under whose immediate guidance they always discharged their official duties; and we are bound, at the risk of certain punishment, to attach to them divine authority(15). (Mark 16: 15, 6: 11.) Nor have we any reason to fear, that the apostles might have neglected to treasure up in their memory with sufficient care, those declarations of Jesus which regarded themselves, as they had occasion so frequently, even in the commencement of their apostleship, to recall those declarations, and to compare them with their own experience.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The selection of the apostles by Jesus.

This is recorded Mark 3: 13—19. Compare Acts 1: 2—13.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The exception of Judas the traitor.

During his last addresses to his disciples, Jesus always expressed himself with reserve, as long as Judas was amongst them, John 13: 10, 17—19; but as soon as Judas was gone, he ex-

pressed unqualified approbation of his disciples, and gave them the most ample promises. Judas was therefore the only one to whom the commission, which he gave to his disciples at his departure, was not to be applied.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The apostolic commission.

See John 17: 18, 20. 20: 21. Matth. 28 : 16—20. Luke 24: 47. Acts 1: 8. 10: 42. Mark 16: 14, 15. The genuineness of the latter passage is vindicated in Diss. I. in libror. N. Test. historicorum aliquot locos.[2] On the genuineness of the conclusion of the Gospel of Mark, the reader may also see Paulus' Commentary,[3] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament,[4] Hug's Introduction,[5] and Kuinöl Commentarii in Marcum et Lucam.[6] The latter work contains additional references, as well as a compendious view of the evidence for and against the genuineness of this passage. See also Thiess' New critical Commentary on the New Testament.[7] To the writers mentioned by the two last authors, may be added Gratz's "Attempt to account for the origin of the first three Gospels," Tübingen 1812, in which the genuineness of this passage is disputed.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Jesus expected that his Father would support and aid the apostles.

See John 15: 16. 17: 15, 20.

---

1 See the work "On the Object of John's Gospel &c." p. 210 &c. and Flatt's Mag. No. 7. Pt. 2.

2 Opusc. acad. Vol. III. p. 50 &c.

3 Pt. III. p. 885 &c.

4 Pt. I. p. 576—579.

5 Pt. II. p. 192—196.

6 p. 188.

7 Pt. II. p. 222 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The apostles were the companions of Jesus.

See Mark 3 : 14, εποιησε δωδεκα, ἱνα ωσι μετ' αυτου, he appointed twelve, that they should remain with him. John 15: 27. Compare Acts 1: 21 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

The apostles were witnesses of his works and doctrines.

See John 15: 27. 17: 6—8, 14. Luke 24: 45—48. Acts 1: 2, 3, 21, 22. 10: 39, 41.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Supernatural aid was combined with the use of their own faculties in the case of the apostles.

Matth. 13: 52. 10: 27. There certainly were instances in which the apostles were to speak without any preparation, Luke 21: 14, and in which their superior helper, who promised to supply the want of preparation, must necessarily do more than merely inspire them with intrepidity and presence of mind; since otherwise they could not dispense with previous reflection, so necessary to give value and effect to their communications. There were instances in which, by the special aid of Christ[1] or[2] of the Holy Spirit,[3] the apostles were, in the very moment of their delivery, εν αυτη τη ὡρᾳ, supplied with the words or the truths which they were to utter,[4] and previous meditation was thus rendered unnecessary.[5] But the promise contained in the texts referred to, specifies the occasions when this aid should be given; namely, when they were arraigned before a public tribunal, and had to speak in selfdefence, and conse-

[1] Luke 21: 15. [2] John 16: 13—15. [3] Luke 12: 12.

[4] v. 12. Matth. 10: 19. Mark 13: 11. [5] v. 11.

quently stood in greater need of special assistance than in the discharge of the ordinary duties of their office. Still, one thing at least, follows from this promise, namely, that in every case in which their circumstances rendered it necessary, the Spirit of God did suggest to the apostles, what they should utter. Other cases might occur, beside those of their judicial defence, in which the apostles would need such special aid in the discharge of their official duties; and we learn from some passages of Scripture,[1] that they were authorised to expect such special aid on such occasions, as well as when arraigned before the tribunal of their enemies. But if special aid was given whenever it was necessary, it follows that when it was not given, it would have been superfluous; and, therefore, that when the apostles were left to the use of their own powers, their instructions were no less conformable to the will of their divine Instructor, than when they were directed by his special aid.

NOTE. From Acts 23 : 5, a suspicion may arise, that the apostle Paul, in his defence before the Jewish sanhedrim, took refuge under a falsehood. But Michaelis, in his Annotations in loc. p. 419—422, and in his Introduction to N. T. p. 53 &c. has proved from Josephus, that Ananias was not at that time, properly the highpriest; but had previously been removed, and at this time, when there was no highpriest, he was arbitrarily acting in that capacity. Now, either this was not known to Paul, who had arrived at Jerusalem only a few days previously, or Paul intends, by the words *ουκ ηδειν ὁτι εστιν αρχιερευς* I did not know that he was highpriest, to insinuate that Ananias actually was not highpriest.[2]

---

1 John 14: 26. 16: 12—15.

2 Compare also Hess' "History and Writings of the Apostles of Jesus, Vol. II. p. 411 &c. 3d edit. 1809—1811.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

See John 14: 17, *πνευμα της αληθειας* the Spirit of truth. 16: 13—15. 1 Cor. 2: 10, 11.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Ὑπομνησει ὑμας παντα ἁ ειπον ὑμιν he will remind you of all things which I have told you, John 14: 26.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

Nature of the aid afforded by the Spirit to the apostles.

In the dissertation, On the nature of Inspiration, it is clearly proved, that the interpretation of the words, John 14: 16, 26. 15: 26. 16 : 7, 13—16, which makes those promises of the constant aid and influence of the Spirit to signify nothing more than an ordinary agency of *Divine Providence* favouring the natural and gradual expansion of the views of the apostles ; does not at all harmonize with those promises.[1] "Nothing but the promise of extraordinary divine aid, and of communications from a superior power, could have afforded satisfaction and tranquillity to the disciples of Jesus. And the nature of the Saviour's words evinces, that he intended to awaken in his disciples and apostles, the expectation of extraordinary aid."

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Τα ερχομενα αναγγελει ὑμιν he will show you things to come, John 16: 13.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

Διδαξει ΠΑΝΤΑ he shall show you *all things*, John 14: 21. *Ὁδηγησει ὑμας εις ΠΑΣΑΝ την αληθειαν* he will conduct you into *all* truth, 16: 13.

---

[1] Flatt's Mag. Vol. II. No. 1. p. 19—23.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

The nature and personality of the παρακλητος, or Comforter.

It is evident from the predicates *διδαξει* and *ὑπομνησει*, which are applied to the *παρακλητος* John 12: 16, that by the Comforter must be intended such an assistant as *instructs* and *reminds*. The accordance of this signification of the word, with the usage of the language, is proved in Lösner's Observv. ex Philone, on John 14: 16, in Vollborth's Programm on *παρακλητος*, Göttingen, 1786, p. 13 &c. and Ernesti Opusc. philol. crit. p. 215. the edit. of Lardner. The evidence adduced in these works, to prove that *παρακλητος* signifies a teacher or adviser, is derived partly from the signification of the words *παρακαλειν* (Tit. 1:9. 2:15) and *παρακλησις* (1 Thess. 3:2); partly from some passages of Philo, especially in his treatise "De mundi Opificio," T. 1. p. 5. ed. Mangey. where it is said: *ουδενι παρακλητῳ, μονῳ δε αυτῳ χρησαμενος ὁ θεος εγνω*—i. e. employing no counsellor, but following his own pleasure, God determined; and partly from the Hebrew word מליץ (interpreter), which is twice rendered by פרקלים (*παρακλητος*) in the Chaldee Version.[1] But we have no objection to the more general sense of the word *παρακλητος assistant, helper*, which is given by Knapp.[2] For the nature of the case proves, that he who was to aid the apostles in the discharge of their duties,[3] must necessarily have been an instructor in the truth, *πνευμα της αληθειας*, John 14: 17. 15: 26. 16: 13.

---

1 On the different explanations of the word *παρακλητος*, the reader may consult the Programm of Knapp, and Kuinöl's Comment. on John 14: 15.

2 "Programma de Spiritu Sancto et Christo Paracletis," item "De varia potestate vocabulorum *παρακαλειν*, *παρκλησις*, *παρακλητος*," Halle, 1790. "Scripta varii argumenti, maximam partem exegetici," Halle, 1805, N. IV.

3 John 15: 26. 16: 8 &c. Acts 1: 8. Luke 24: 48 &c.

The commission of the apostles was, to teach and to promulgate the doctrines of Christ (Matth. 28: 20) agreeably to his intention (John 17: 18, 20) and meaning (16: 13—15); it was, therefore, only by instructing them, and bringing to their recollection things forgotten, that this Assistant could enable the apostles to publish the doctrines of Jesus, agreeably to his intention, and to give their instructions an infallibility equal to the instructions of Christ himself, John 13 : 20. Matth. 16 : 19. Now this infallibility of the apostolical instrucions could not be attained, unless their divine Assistant should recall to their recollection the declarations of Christ, and instruct them [1] in those cases in which they either had not fully comprehended, or had partially forgotten those declarations ;[2] or, in which Christ had purposely omitted giving them full instruction on some topics which they were nevertheless to explain and teach after his death (John 16: 12). We cannot safely attribute the doctrines of the apostles to the Holy Spirit [3] and to Christ (John 16 : 13—15), unless we suppose that their divine Assistant, who authenticated their doctrines by miracles,[4] at the same time, by his supernatural influence, made those doctrines worthy of that faith which the Spirit of truth endeavoured to procure for them by his miracles.[5] The great miracle of a divine and therefore infallible system of doctrines, originating from Jesus himself, would with most christians, have failed of its intended effect, if God had not proved by a supernatural influence on the minds

1 John 15: 26. 16: 13—15. Comp. 1 Cor. 2: 8—13. § 10.

2 Compare Plank's "Introduction to the Theological Sciences," Pt. I. p. 367.

3 John 16: 8. Matth. 10 : 20. Compare Ill. 14. John 15 : 26. Comp. Acts 15: 28.

4 John. 14: 12. Rom. 15: 19. 1 Cor. 12: 11. § 10.

5 1 John 5 : 6. "The supernatural gifts of the Spirit, prove that the doctrines published by the Spirit are true."—On the object of John, p. 227.

of the apostles, that the doctrines taught by them actually were the unadulterated doctrines of Christ.[1]

Eichhorn's "Bibliothek"[2] contains the assertion, that παρακλητος signifies the *doctrine* itself which Christ taught, and the more enlarged view of it which the apostles obtained after the resurrection and ascension of Christ. But this is contradicted by the fact, that the παρακλητος, Comforter, stands in a *relation*, both to Christ who taught the doctrine of the Paraclete (John 15: 13—15, and to his apostles who obtained this more enlarged view of the doctrines of Christ after his death, in which the *doctrine* of Christ and his apostles could not stand towards them; see Matth. 10 : 20. John 15 : 26, 27. And, although, upon that supposition, the phrase αλλος παρακλητος, another Comforter (John 14 : 16), might indicate a counterpart to Jesus as a personal instructor, or to his oral instructions, inasmuch as it would import, that the doctrines which Jesus taught, were more fully developed and confirmed by his resurrection and ascension; the inconsistency must be palpable, when we read further, and see Jesus proving to his disciples, at full length, as he does in John 16: 13—15, that his doctrines, when properly illustrated by his resurrection and ascension, would not differ at all from the doctrines he had already taught them; and that these doctrines were altogether his own, ὁ παρακλητος ου λαλησει αφ' ἑαυτου, αλλ' ὁσα αν ακουση λαλησει the Comforter will not speak of himself, but will relate the things which he shall have heard; and that these doctrines will promote his glory, because they are *his* doctrines, εκεινος δοξασει εμε, ὁτι εκ του εμου ληψεται he will glorify me, because he will take of mine. On the contrary, the phrase αλλος παρακλητος, has a natural meaning, if we suppose it to signify a new, invisible *teacher*,

[1] Tübing. gel. Anzeig. Jahrg. 1794, No. 170. p. 131—134.
[2] Vol. IV. p. 298 &c.

who was to supply the place of Jesus, who had instructed them by personal intercourse; for in this case, it was necessary for Jesus to inform his disciples, that their new assistant was in the closest union with himself, and therefore would communicate only such instructions as would accord with the doctrines which he, their former teacher, had delivered to them. Moreover, in Matth. 10 : 20, there is a clear distinction made between the *apostles*, who spake and vindicated the cause of Christ (v. 19. Luke 12 : 11. 21 : 14), and the *Spirit* of their Father, who spake through them : *ου γαρ υμεις εστε οι λαλουντες, αλλα το πνευμα του πατρος υμων το λαλουν εν υμιν* for it is not *you* that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh by you. This distinction could not have been made, if the apostles themselves were the only persons that spoke, and if the *πνευμα λαλουν εν αυτοις*, was merely the enlarged view which they had of the doctrine of Christ. Further, we cannot see how Christ could have rendered all preparation unnecessary to the apostles, when called on to defend themselves, unless it was by the promise of supernatural instruction, to be given them at the very time when they were to speak in selfdefence (Matth. 10: 19. Mark 13: 11. Luke 21: 14). For, however perfect might have been their knowledge of the doctrines of Jesus after his resurrection, still, in every case in which they were called to vindicate his cause, it would be profitable to the cause of truth, to recall the doctrines to their memories, and to reflect on the circumstances in which they were to defend them. Finally, how could Christ (John 15: 12) have distinguished between the testimony of the Paraclete, whom the Father should send to them, and the testimony which the apostles themselves should bear, having learned it by their personal intercourse with him; if *παρακλητος* signified nothing else than that enlarged view of the doctrines of Jesus, which the apostles should ac-

quire after his death (John 15: 27)? *ὁ παρακλητος ὁν εγω πεμψω παρα του πατρος—εκεινος μαρτυρησει περι εμου· και ὑμεις δε μαρτυρειτε, ὁτι απ' αρχης μετ' εμου εστε* the Comforter whom I shall send from my father, *he* will bear witness of me; and *ye* also shall bear witness, because ye were with me from the beginning. It has already been seen, that the personal agency of the apostles was not excluded by the peculiar divine aid which they received; as is feared by a writer in Eichhorn's Bibl. sup. cit. p. 300. See also § 11 infra.

ILLUSTRATION 14.

The divine assistance afforded to the apostles, extended to all their instructions.

The words (Matth. 10: 20) *ου γαρ ὑμεις εστε* (not *εσεσθε* comp. also Mark 13: 11) *—λαλουν εν ὑμιν* for it is not ye who speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you, cannot well refer merely to their defence before a public tribunal; for it had been stated in the previous verse, that every thing which it should be necessary for them to say at that particular juncture, should be suggested to them; but they seem rather to refer to *all* their instructions, and to contain the ground of the promise in the verse immediately preceding. The idea of Jesus seems to be this: "For, the instructions which ye my apostles in general give, are derived, not so much[1] from yourselves, as from the Holy Spirit; hence, when you are called upon to defend your doctrines, ye need feel no anxiety, but may confidently rely on the Holy Spirit to vindicate his own doctrines, by suggesting to you the very words of your defence." In like manner, Peter speaks (1 Pet. 1: 12) of the preachers of the gospel *των ευαγγελισαμενων*, as those who

[1] *Ου* expresses, in this place, a comparative negation, as it does in Philipp. 2: 21. Col. 3: 23. See Opusc. Acad. Vol. I. p. 331. Vol. II. p. 201. Observv. p. 251 s.

spake not by themselves, but by the aid of the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven; that is, in speaking, they received such aid from the Holy Spirit, that their doctrines could with propriety be ascribed to the Holy Spirit as their author (John 16: 8).

ILLUSTRATION 15.

Divine authority of the Apostles.

In Matth. 16: 19, Christ gives to the apostle Peter, and in Matth. 18 : 18, to the other apostles also, a superintendance over the church, *κλεις της βασιλειας των ουρανων* — summam potestatem regni coelestis, ss. in terra, "the keys of the kingdom of the heavens"—the supreme power in his church, on earth (Is. 22: 22), and the power to enact laws which should be of divine authority, *δησαι και λυσαι* to bind and to loose.[1] And of John 13 : 20, the proper meaning is this: "whoever puts confidence in my messengers, believes in me; and whosoever puts confidence in me, believes in him that sent me." *Λαμβανειν* here signifies the same as *πιστευειν* in John 5 : 43, comp. v. 44, 46, 48; i. e. to put confidence in a person, not to reject him, to receive his declarations (John 12: 48), to listen to him (Matth. 10: 40. Luke 10: 11), *δεχεσθαι, μη δεχεσθαι—ακουειν, αθετειν.*[2] To these passages may be added the two following: 1 John 4: 6, "We (I and the other apostles) are not of the world, but of God. He that knows God, will hear us;"[3] and 1 Pet. 1: 23, in which the efficacy and unchangeable identity of the apostolical doctrines are inferred from their divine origin (comp. v. 25 and 12), *λογος ζωντος θεου—ῥημα ευαγγελισθεν εις ὑμας* the word of the living God—the word which is preached unto you.

---

1 Vide Dissert. de notione regni coelestis, p. 32 s. Opusc. acad. Vol. I. p. 290 &c. Compare Kuinöl Comment. in Matth. ad h. l.

2 Compare what the author says on John 13 : 20, in Flatt's Mag. Vol. VII. p. 67 &c.

3 On the Object of John, p. 394.

The passage Gal. 2: 11 &c. contains no objection to the divine authority of the apostles. For Paul does not there censure the doctrines, but the *conduct* of Peter (v. 14); because the Jewish christians at Jerusalem, (whose deportment was disapproved of by the apostle James himself Acts 15 : 24), might have made use of this conduct of Peter to the prejudice of that doctrine, the truth of which Peter himself, as well as Paul, acknowledged (v. 15—16), notwithstanding his conduct in this instance was not consistent with it. Peter and Paul had alike acknowledged the principle, that no one could be justified on the ground of his fulfilment of the law, but that we must be justified by putting our trust in Christ; and from this principle, both had inferred, that those who believe in Christ, and thus obtain assurance of salvation, are no longer obliged to observe those ceremonies which have no influence in producing *δικαιωσιν* justification and salvation (see Acts 15 : 8—11). Peter's withdrawing from the Gentile christians, when the Jewish converts from Jerusalem arrived (Gal. 2: 12), was dissimulation, and not the result of a change in his *opinion* on that subject; for Peter did not attempt to defend himself against the public rebuke of Paul. (v. 11, 14 &c.) But the advocates for the law, who had come from Jerusalem to Antioch, might have regarded the conduct of Peter as being a refusal on his part to acknowledge the uncircumcised gentiles as christian brethren. Thus they might have derived from it support to their doctrine, by which they endeavoured to bind the gentile converts to circumcision and the Levitical law. They might have inferred from it, that the great principle that we are justified not by obeying the law of Moses, not by observing the ceremonies prescribed by it, but exclusively by trusting in Christ, was an erroneous and pernicious principle.[1]

[1] See the Dissert. on the Object of the death of Christ, in the epistle to the Hebrews, p. 458—461. and Michaelis' Notes on Gal. 2: 12 &c.

§ 10.

The authority of the apostle Paul.

The apostle Paul claimed equal authority with the other apostles(1). For he asserts that he was chosen by Christ himself(2), to be his messenger (3); that the power of God made him competent to discharge the duties of his office(4); that the doctrines of Christianity, which neither his nor any other human intellect could have discovered by any course of investigation(5), were not taught him by any man, not by an older apostle(6), but were revealed(7) to him by the almighty agency of God himself(8); and finally, that the inspiration(9) of the divine Spirit extended even to his words, and to all his exhibitions of revealed truths (10). We learn from the apostle Paul himself, that this Spirit, who revealed to him unknown truths, extended the same aid to *him* as to the other apostles, and in the discharge of *all* his official duties(11). This divine influence(12), therefore, was not confined to his teaching those truths which are properly termed revealed doctrines(13); but when he was inculcating truths which he had learned in other ways(14), and when giving commands(15) or advice founded on these truths(16), his communications were accordant with the will of Christ, with which the Spirit made him acquainted(17); and thus his instructions could with propriety all

---

The rejected construction of this contest between Peter and Paul, and of its importance and consequences, which is adopted in some late works, e. g. in the Catholic Epistles of Augusti, Pt. I. p. 167 &c. and in Schmidt's Historico-critical Introduction to the New Test. Pt. I. p. 193 &c. is unsupported by historical evidence. Comp. Tüb. gel. Anz. I. 1802, s. 815 f. Jahr, 1807, s. 204. and Hess' "History and Writings of the apostles of Jesus," Pt. II. p. 312 &c.

be ascribed to the Lord, or to the Spirit of the Lord (18). They derived their authority(19) and credibility(20) from him, who was the perpetual Instructor of the apostle, and who would have prevented him from making any communications which were either wholly or in part inconsistent with the will of Christ. Hence the apostle says, in general, that Christ taught by him(21); and that his doctrines were to be regarded and obeyed as the doctrines of God and not of man(22). The reality of Paul's having experienced divine teaching and illumination, appears from the evident credibility(23) of the history of his call to the apostolical office, an office for which he could be qualified only by a special divine influence (§ 9); and likewise from his miracles(24), the historical truth of which was so incontrovertible that even when addressing his enemies(25), he could appeal to them in confirmation of his doctrines(26) and of his apostolical authority(27.) The other apostles also had no hesitation in acknowledging him as a fellow apostle(28).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The apostolical dignity of Paul

Is asserted by himself, in 1 Cor. 9 : 1, 5. 2 Cor. 11 : 5. 12: 11. *ουδεν ὑστερησα των ὑπερ λιαν αποστολων* I am not inferior to the most distinguished apostles.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

That he was divinely appointed to his office,

Is declared in Gal. 1: 1, *αποστολος, ουκ απ᾽ ανθρωπων, ουδε δι᾽ ανθρωπου, αλλα δια του Ιησου Χριστου* an apostle, not of man,

nor by man, but by Jesus Christ. Rom. 1 : 1, 5. 1 Cor. 1: 17. 1 Tim. 1: 11, 12. Acts 26: 15—18. 22: 10—15.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

2 Cor. 5 : 20, *ὑπερ Χριστου πρεσβευομεν* we are sent as ambassadors of Christ; comp. John 17: 18.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

2 Cor. 3: 5, 6, *ὁ θεος ἱκανωσεν ἡμας διακονους καινης διαθηκης* God hath qualified us to be ministers of the new covenant.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

1 Cor. 2: 7, *λαλουμεν θεου σοφιαν εν μυστηριῳ* I speak the wisdom of God, which was heretofore a mystery. 9: 11. Eph. 3: 9, 10, *μυστηριον αποκεκρυμμενον απο των αιωνων εν τῳ θεῳ* the mystery which was known only to God, from the beginning of the world.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Paul did not receive his instructions from any older apostle.

Gal. 1 : 11, 12, 17. As Paul was not to learn from the other apostles, but, (like the others, Acts 1: 21. § 9), was to testify to the things which *he* had seen and heard (Acts 22: 14, 15. 26 : 16. 1 Cor. 9 : 1), therefore Christ, now in heaven, revealed to him many things, which he had communicated to his other apostles during his residence on earth. To such revelations our Lord doubtless refers, when he uses the future *οφθησομαι* I will appear unto thee (Acts 26: 16). An example of such immediate instruction is found in 1 Cor. 10 : 23, where Paul says he was thus instructed relative to the Lord's Supper, *εγω παρελαβον απο του κυριου* I received from the Lord. From Acts 26 : 16, where Christ tells Paul that he

shall be a witness both of the things which he had seen, and which he would hereafter communicate to him, *ων τε ειδες, ων τε οφθησομαι σοι*· it is evident that the preterites in the passage Acts 22 : 15, *εση μαρτυς—ων εωρακας και ηκουσας*, do not refer to the past only, but also to future time. Comp. John 4 : 38, *απεστειλα*.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Immediate suggestion of God, the source of Paul's knowledge.

Gal. 1: 12, 16, *το ευαγγελιον—παρελαβον—δι' αποκαλυψεως Ιησου Χριστου* the Gospel — I received — by a revelation from Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 2: 10, 12, *ημιν απεκαλυψεν ὁ θεος δια του πνευματος αυτου* God revealed it to us by his Spirit. Eph. 3: 2 &c. *κατα αποκαλυψιν εγνωρισε μοι* (sc. *ὁ θεος*,) *το μυστηριον*, by revelation he (God) made known to me the mystery ; comp. v. 5.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

2 Cor. 4: 6, *ὁ θεος ὁ ειπων εκ σκοτους φως λαμψαι* (sc. *εστιν*[2]) *ὁς ελαμψεν εν ταις καρδιαις ημων* the God who commanded light to shine out of darkness (it is, that) hath shined into our hearts. The words *ὁ θεος—λαμψαι* refer to the omnipotence of God ; see Gen. 1: 2, and the work On the object of John, p. 494.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

2 Cor. 5: 19, *θεμενος εν ημιν τον λογον της καταλλαγης* and gave to us by inspiration, the doctrine of reconciliation with

---

1 In Dissert. I, in Libror. N. T. historicorum aliquot locos, not. 50. Opusc. acad. Vol. III. p. 30, it is remarked, that the aorists often indicate the present and future as well as the past time. Vigerus de Graecae dictionis idiotismis, p. 204 &c.

2 The propriety of supplying *εστι* in this place, is shown in the Dissert. Notitiae historicae epp. ad Corinthios interpretationi inservientes, Note 190.

God through Christ. *Θεμενος* stands connected with *ην* some distance preceding, and must be construed with the words *θεος ην καταλλασσων*, and not with the succeeding *μη αυτων*.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 10.

1 Cor. 2 : 13. In the Dissert. Notitiae historicae in epp. ad Corinth. note 45,[2] it is proved, from 1 Cor. 1: 17——2: 16, that Paul clearly distinguishes between the doctrine itself and the manner in which it is communicated: and that he derives evidence of the divinity of his doctrine, from the fact that although his manner of teaching was void of all the ornaments of artificial oratory, *ουκ εν πειθοις σοφιας λογοις*, yet it was so efficacious that its influence must have proceeded from the. *πνευμα ἁγιον* the Holy Spirit.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

1 Cor. 2 : 12, *ελαβομεν το πνευμα το εκ του θεου* we have received the Spirit which is of God. 1 Cor. 6 : 40, *δοκω δε κἀγω πνευμα θεου εχειν* I think I also have the Spirit of God; comp. 1 Cor. 9: 1—3. 2 Cor. 12: 11.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

2 Cor. 5 : 20, *ὡς του θεου παρακαλουντος δι' ἡμων* as if God besought you by us; 2 Cor. 2: 17, *εκ θεου λαλουμεν* we speak as from God; *εκ from*, indicates the author of a thing, as in John 10: 32, comp. 14 : 10, *πολλα καλα εργα εκ του πα-*

---

[1] See the Dissert. "On the Object of the death of Jesus, p. 409 &c. Kypke, on Acts 19: 21, remarks that the expression *θεσθαι εν καρδια (φρησι) τινος* is most frequently used of foreign communications, or suggestions from without. That the proposition *και θεμενος—καταλλαγης* must refer to the apostles alone, is stated in Gabler's Programma, Novae curae in locum Paulinum 2 Cor. 5 : 14—21, Pt. III. p. 13. He explains the words *θεμενος εν ἡμιν* : imposuit, h. e. demandavit nobis.

[2] Opuscul. acad. Vol. II. p. 267—270.

τρος—ὁ πατηρ ποιει τα εργα many good works of the Father—the Father doeth the works. Comp. also John 5: 19 &c. The same signification εκ has in 1 Cor. 1: 30, εξ αυτου (θεου) "Deo efficiente." See the Dissert. on the epistles to the Corinthians, note 189. 22). In 1 Thess. 4 : 15, Paul says τουτο λεγομεν ὑμιν εν λογῳ κυριου this we say unto you as by the command of the Lord.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

Here belongs what Paul teaches of Christ as the cause of our salvation, 2 Cor. 2 : 17, ὡς εκ θεου εν Χριστῳ λαλουμεν: "Deo nos moderante, de Christo praecipimus," i. e. God directing us, we teach concerning Christ. The doctrines concerning Christ, in 2 Cor. 4 : 6. 1 Cor. 2 : 7 &c. (comp. v. 1 μαρτυριον θεου), are represented as revealed truths.[1] To the head of revealed doctrines, taken in the more limited sense, as signifying doctrines which men could not discover by their own faculties, belong also the hidden things of futurity, (John 16: 13), a knowledge of which was communicated to the apostle Paul. 1 Thess. 4: 15 &c. Comp. 1 Cor. 15: 51.

ILLUSTRATION 14.

Thus he relates his own history, 2 Cor. 11 : 22—12: 18, which he himself would of course recollect.

ILLUSTRATION 15.

Thus 1 Thess. 4: 3—7, contains injunctions, the propriety of which even reason and conscience teach.

ILLUSTRATION 16.

In 1 Cor. 7: 12, 25, 40. 2 Cor. 8: 8, 10, he distinguishes

[1] Compare Meyer's "Developement of Paul's doctrinal system, p. 344 &c. Altona, 1801.

between his own counsels and the commands of God. — *εγω λεγω, ουκ ὁ κυριος—επιταγην κυριου ουκ εχω, γνωμην δε διδωμι—κατα την εμην γνωμην—ου κατ᾽ επιταγην λεγω—γνωμην εν τουτῳ διδωμι* I say, and not the Lord—I have no command of the Lord, but I give my judgment—according to my judgment—I speak not by command—I give my judgment in this matter. See Kypke On the signification of *γνωμην διδωμι* in 1 Cor. 7: 25.

ILLUSTRATION 17.

1 Cor. 2 : 16, *ἡμεις νουν Χριστου εχομεν* we have been made acquainted with the mind of Christ, comp. v. 12, *ελαβομεν το πνευμα το εκ θεου* we have received the Spirit which is of God. See also John 16 : 13—15 *εκ του εμου ληψεται*, ss. *πνευμα* he, (i. e. the Spirit) shall take of mine.

ILLUSTRATION 18.

Paul's doctrines are justly considered as the doctrines of God.

2 Cor. 12 : 19, *εν Χριστῳ λαλουμεν* — "juvante ac moderante Domino." This is the interpretation given in note 152 of the dissert. quoted in Illust. 12, agreeably to the signification of *εν* in 1 Cor. 12 : 3, and in Matth. 22 : 43. In the same dissertation, the passage 2 Cor. 11 : 16, 17, containing these words *ὁ λαλω, ου λαλω κατα τον κυριον, αλλ᾽ ὡς εν αφροσυνῃ*, is thus explained : "If ye cannot agree to acquit me of the folly of boasting, then let ME only speak thus foolishly. What I say in favour of myself, let me be understood to speak out of my own folly, and not under the influence of Christ." *Ου λαλω* would then be used agreeably to a customary idiom, for *ου δοκω λαλειν*.[1] According to this interpretation, the *αφροσυνη* fol-

1 See "Observv. ad analogiam et syntaxin Hebraicam pertinentes," p. 14. no. 2.

ly, which Paul ascribes to himself, was not *αφροσυνη folly*, in Paul's own esteem, but only in the opinion of his opponents. What renders this explanation the more probable, is, that in v. 16 he says: "Again, I write unto you, let no one suppose me to be a fool;" and in 12: 19, assures us that he speaks *κατενωπιον του θεου εν Χριστῳ* in the presence of God, in Christ. But if, notwithstanding these proofs, we should still believe that Paul here attributes to himself a deviation from propriety *αφροσυνην*, and thu sshows that, at this time, he was not under the influence of the Lord; still the passage would even then prove, that ordinarily he did speak under the influence of the Lord; since he deemed it necessary to state this extraordinary case as being an exception, and distinctly to confine the exception to what he said in selfcommendation. Here belong also the passages, 1 Thess. 4: 2, *δια του κυριου Ιησου* through the Lord Jesus; and 1 Cor. 7: 40 *δοκω δε κἀγω πνευμα θεου εχειν* I think I also have the Spirit of God.

ILLUSTRATION 19.

1 Thess. 4: 8. 2 Cor. 2: 9. 10: 6. In the two latter passages, Paul demands obedience (*ὑπακοην*) to his decisions, as to injunctions more than human.

ILLUSTRATION 20.

1 Cor. 5: 25, "Even if I am not giving laws by divine command, still I am communicating *my advice* the counsel of one whom the grace of God has made worthy of confidence; —in other words, the advice of one, whom, notwithstanding his unworthiness, the Lord graciously held in sufficient estimation (1 Tim. 1: 13), to confide to him the apostolical office (1 Tim. 1: 12. Acts 9: 15), and who therefore, on account of the confidence reposed in him by the Lord, and the influences of the grace given him (1 Tim. 1: 12, *τῳ ενδυναμωσαντι με Χριστῳ*),

is really worthy of confidence, i. e. is to be accredited as a true teacher, a teacher *εν πιστει και αληθειᾳ* in faith and truth, one who gives no advice which is not approved of by his Lord."

ILLUSTRATION 21.

2 Cor. 13: 3, *του εν εμοι λαλουντος Χριστου* Christ speaking in me. In Heb. 1: 1. 12: 25 (compare with 2 : 3), Paul represents his doctrine as the doctrine of the Son of God; and states, that in consequence of the exalted dignity of the author of these doctrines, those who rejected them exposed themselves to the most severe punishments.

ILLUSTRATION 22.

1 Thess. 2: 13, *λογον ακοης παρ' ἡμων—εδεξασθε ου λογον ανθρωπων, αλλα, καθως εστιν αληθως, λογον θεου* the word of instruction (of hearing, auditûs) from us, ye received it, not as the word of men, but, as it truly is, as the word of God. 2 Thess. 2: 15. 2 Tim. 3: 14.

ILLUSTRATION 23.

The historical credibility of the account of Paul's miraculous call to the apostleship.

Paul's call to the apostleship by the immediate appearance of Christ to him,[1] was connected with such changes in the public transactions of the day, that the attention of the sanhedrim at Jerusalem and of many others must necessarily have been arrested by it. For Paul was well known at Jerusalem, was a Pharisee, and an important and peculiarly active agent of the sanhedrim in persecuting the christians.[2] The very journey to Damascus, on which his conversion to christianity and call to

---

[1] 1 Cor. 15: 8, 9. Acts 22: 10, 14 &c. 26: 15—20.

[2] Acts 22: 3—5, 19, 20. 26: 4, 5, 10, 11. 9: 13.

the apostolic office occurred, was undertaken by the authority of the highpriest and the sanhedrim, and for the purpose of searching for christians and bringing them captive to Jerusalem.[1] The sanhedrim therefore, could not have been ignorant of his conversion.[2] And this sudden change actually excited universal surprise at Damascus and in the congregations of Judea.[3] Now, is it reasonable to suppose, that Paul would, in Jerusalem itself, the very place from which, in company with others, he set out for Damascus clothed with public authority, and in the presence of a populace who were exasperated against him, relate the celestial vision which appeared to him on this journey,[4] and appeal to the sanhedrim, by whose command he travelled thither;[5] if it had not been a notorious fact,[6] that something extraordinary occurred to him on the way, and if his fellow travellers had not been compelled to testify that he suddenly became blind, and that they were obliged to lead him?[7] Of the truth of his account of his recovering his sight, they needed not testimony, for they had ocular demonstration.[8]

The reader may find the history of the conversion of the apostle Paul, treated in different ways, and viewed in various lights, in the works of Eckermann,[9] Ammon[10] Eichhorn,[11]

---

1 Acts 9: 1—3, 21. 22: 5, 6. 26: 12, 13. 2 Acts 22: 5.

3 Acts 9: 21. Gal. 1: 23. 4 Acts ch. 22. 5 Acts 22: 5.

6 Acts 26: 26. v. 9 &c. 7 Acts 22: 9—11.

8 Acts 22: 13. See Michaelis' Notes on Acts 9: 7. and the "Address to a female friend" above cited, p. 256 &c.

9 Theolog. Beitrage, B. II. St. 1. p. 1 ff.

10 De repentina Pauli ad doctrinam Christianam conversione. Opusc. Theol. Enlangen, 1793.

11 Allgemeine Bibliothek der Biblischen Literature, B. VI. St. 1. S. 1 ff, on the narrative of Paul's conversion.

Stäudlin,[1] Hensler,[2] Schmidt,[3] Haselaar,[4] Cludius,[5] and Heinrich.[6] In refutation of the rash hypothesis of the author of "the History of the great Prophet of Nazareth," namely, "That the appearance of Christ to Paul, was not after Christ's ascension to heaven, but during the lifetime of Jesus;" see the remarks on the work entitled, "The risen Jesus," the "Supplement to the natural history of the great Prophet of Nazareth," in Tüb. gel. Anzeig.[7] and "The history of primitive christianity, in connexion with the natural history of the great Nazarene Prophet."[8]

ILLUSTRATION 24.

Acts 13: 9—12. 14: 8—11. 19: 11, 12. 28: 3—10. comp. Rom. 15: 18, 19.

ILLUSTRATION 25.

Miraculous spiritual gifts.

The apostle Paul could appeal, and without the least fear of contradiction, even to his enemies, for the reality of those miraculous spiritual gifts,[9] which were bestowed on the Corinthians[10] by his instrumentality, and of which he speaks at large in the 14th ch. of his first epistle to those christians. This subject is discussed by the author of this work, in a Dissertation

---

1 Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, B. I. S. 715 ff.

2 "The truth and divinity of christianity," p. 83 &c. Keil, 1803.

3 Introd. to the New Test. Pt. I. p. 187 &c. Compare the Tübing. gel. Anzeigen, for 1807, p. 203.

4 Dissert. exegetica de nonnullis Actorum apostolicorum et epp. Paulinarum ad historiam Pauli pertinentibus locis, 1806. Comp. the Haller Lit. Zeit. No. 90, for 1809.

5 Uransichten des Christenthums, Altona, 1808. s. 134 ff.

6 Nov. Test. perpetua annotatione illustratum, Acta Apostol. P. I. ad Act. 9. "Jesu universalreligion," S. 44 ff. Leipsic, 1811.

7 For 1803. p. 93 &c. 8 Vol. I. 1807. Tüb. gel. Anz. 1808, p. 315.

9 2 Cor. 12: 12. Gal. 3: 5. Heb. 2: 3, 4. 10 1 Cor. 12: 8—10.

"on The spiritual gifts of the Corinthian christians," inserted in "Paulus' Neuem Repertorium" for Biblical and Oriental Literature, Pt. III. No. IX. The object of that dissertation, is to vindicate the supernatural origin and the importance of these gifts, against the positions maintained in Eichhorn's Bibliotheca of biblical literature, Vol. II. p. 757 &c. and Paulus' Dissertation "On the foreign languages of the first christians," in the same Repertorium, Pt. I. No. VI. Pt. II. No. VIII. and likewise against a dissertation in the "Contributions for the promotion of rational views of religion," No. XIV. On the peculiar fitness of this kind of miracles, the following remarks are made in the 346th and following pages of this dissertation: 1) The miraculous communication of certain spiritual gifts, was peculiarly useful in establishing the authority of the apostles; because it was not of so transient a nature as the other miracles, and because by it an apostle could exert an agency without being himself present. 2) The absolute truth of the apostolical miracles was more fully established, when the apostles bestowed on some members of the different congregations, power to perform similar miracles. 3) The authority of the apostles could thus be established by miracles, in countries where they had themselves never been, if some of the inhabitants of such countries meeting the apostles elsewhere, and receiving from them this gift, returned in possession of it to their respective homes. 4) The immediate influence of God on the knowledge of the apostles and on their teaching, was rendered the more credible, by the similar experience of those members of the different churches who had received any kind of prophetic gifts.

ILLUSTRATION 26.

Acts 14: 3, *τῳ κυριῳ τῳ μαρτυρουντι τῳ λογῳ της χαριτος αυτου, διδοντι σημεια και τερατα γενεσθαι δια των χειρων αυτων* the Lord, who bore testimony to the doctrine of his

grace, performing signs and wonders by their hands. A similar expression is used Mark 16 : 20, 14, concerning the other apostles. Actions which evidently transcended the power of men, were conclusive evidence of the truth of what the apostles declared, that they were not left to their own power; and they prove that these men were actually under the influence of a superior being, to whom they attributed not only their doctrines (§ 9, 10), but also those visible miracles which, in accordance with the declaration of Jesus (John 14: 12—14), they performed. Acts 3: 12, 13, 16. 4: 7—10, 24, 30. 9: 34, 40. (here Peter prayed to God, and thereby showed that he expected him to perform the miracle.) Acts 13: 11, *χειρ κυριου επι σε* the hand of the Lord is upon you. 14: 10—15. comp. v. 8—14. and Heb. 2: 4. and Rom. 14 : 18 &c. Acts 19: 11. 1 John 5: 6. Vide above § 9.

ILLUSTRATION 27.

2 Cor. 12: 12, *τα σημεια του αποστολου κατειργασθη εν ὑμιν* the signs, or miraculous works of an apostle, were performed among you.

ILLUSTRATION 28.

Gal. 2: 6—9, *Ιακωβος και Κηφας και Ιωαννης—δεξιας εδωκαν εμοι κοινωνιας* James and Cephas and John—gave me the right hand of fellowship; comp. 2 Peter 3 : 15. On the divine mission of Paul, the reader may consult the work of Kleuker, entitled, "Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Schriftlichen Urkunden des Christenthums," Vol. II. § 565—598. Riga, 1794.

§ 11.

Divine authority of the apostolical writings.

If the doctrines of the apostles (§ 9, 10) possess divine authority, the same authority must belong also to their *writings*. Because, in the first place, according to the usage of the language, the words λαλειν(1) and παρακαλειν(2) and other similar expressions (mentioned in § 9, 10), refer as well to written(3) as to oral instructions. Moreover, it is very evident from the nature of the case itself, that the only difference(4) between their written and oral instructions was, that the former were of a more permanent nature, and therefore of more extensive importance than the latter. Nor can any reason be assigned, why as soon as the apostles began to write, they should immediately lose all that knowledge which they had previously possessed, and which they had derived(5) from the instructions of Christ, or of that Spirit who after his death was sent down from heaven; or why this their constant guide, who at all other times assisted them in the discharge of their official duties, should withdraw from them his aid the moment they attempted to write(6). Finally, we read expressly, that they composed their books, if not by the express command(7), yet under the special influence of God(8). Thus when the apostle Paul (2 Cor. 11: 17. comp. § 10. Illust. 18) explicitly permits his readers to consider as uninspired, so much of his epistle as embraced his self commendations; this very limitation implies, that he intended his written instructions generally should be received as the instructions of God(9).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Matth. 10: 20. comp. 1 Cor. 2: 13. 2 Cor. 2: 17. 13: 3.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

2 Cor. 5 : 20, *ὡς του θεου παρακαλουντος δι' ἡμων* as if God were exhorting through us.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

2 Cor. 11: 17. 12: 19. Acts 26: 22. 2 Pet. 1: 21. comp. v. 20. In all these passages *λαλειν* is used of *written* communications. Heb. 13 : 22, *του λογου της παρακλησεως* the word of exhortation. 2 Cor. 10: 11, *τῳ λογῳ δι' επιστολων* in word by my epistles. Acts 15: 15, *οἱ λογοι των προφητων* the words of the prophets.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Paul lays equal stress on the *παραδοσεις δια λογου* traditions inculcated by word, and on *παραδοσεις δι' επιστολης* traditions inculcated by letter, 2 Thess. 2: 15.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

That the apostles, whenever they attempted to write, were not divested of that supernatural aid and knowledge which they previously possessed, is evident from 1 John 1 : 1—3. The passage refers to the things which John, as an eye and ear-witness of the history of Jesus, had committed to writing, in his Gospel.[1] See Eph. 3: 3, 4. 2 Pet. 3: 15.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

That the aids of the Spirit were not withdrawn from them whenever they sat down to write, is evident from 1 Cor. 7 : 40,

[1] See the work "On the object of John, p. 384—387.

where Paul states, that the written advice which he imparts to them (in v. 25 &c.), he gives as a man who enjoyed, (as the other apostles did,) the guidance of the Spirit of God.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

According to Rev. 1: 11, the apostle John received an express command from Christ, to commit to writing, the things which he had seen and heard; (the same was the case of Jeremiah in the O. T. chap. 36;) and in the conclusion of the book (Rev. 22: 18—20) Christ himself pronounces the whole to be *his* work.[1] Those writings of the apostles which were composed without any special command, were nevertheless written by authority from Christ; for they were composed by virtue of that general commission which was given to the apostles. Rom. 1: 5, 6. 15: 15, 16.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The apostles always wrote under the influence of the Holy Spirit.

The nature of this influence, has already been stated, in § 9, 10. The apostles doubtless thought for themselves, that is, exercised their natural faculties and communicated their own thoughts, both in their oral and written instructions. Still, these instructions are to be considered rather the instructions of God, than of the apostles; compare § 9. Illust. 15. § 10. For the substance or matter of them was for the most part communicated to them, if not at the moment when they were speaking or writing, yet previously, either by Christ during his abode with them on earth, or by the Spirit of God. Moreover this perpetual Coadjutor exercised a constant superintendance over all their communications both oral and written; and where

1 New Apology for the Revelation of John, p. 361 &c.

any thing had escaped their memory, recalled it (John 14: 26); and where there was ignorance or error in their views, afforded them the necessary instruction (John 14 : 26. 16 : 13); thus preventing the omission of any thing which the Spirit of God would have them communicate, and guarding them effectually against imperfect or erroneous exhibitions of those truths which they had received from the Lord, whereby the credibility and the divine authority of their instructions generally, would have been rendered doubtful. An instance of an apostle's uttering a truth which he did not comprehend (1 Pet. 1: 10—12), under the guidance of the Spirit, occurs in Acts 2 : 39. For in this passage, by τοις εις μακραν (those afar off), to whom belonged the promise which was to be fulfilled through Christ Jesus, the Spirit evidently intended the Gentiles; but it was not till some time after this, that Peter became fully convinced (Acts 10: 20, 28, 29, 34), that the Gentiles were to be partakers of the blessings purchased by Christ.[1] As the apostles were to be infallible teachers, and their instructions to be received as coming from God (1 Thess. 2: 13. 4: 8), to ensure perfect accuracy to their communications, the superintending influence of the Spirit might be necessary, even when they were inculcating doctrines which had been revealed to them at a former period, or which they had learned in some other way. This is evident from tbe example of those Tyrian prophets mentioned Acts 21: 4. The advice which they, δια πνευματος through the Spirit, gave to the apostle Paul, namely, that he should not go up to Jerusalem, did indeed involve some truth, namely, that imprisonment awaited him there (Acts 20: 23. 21: 11); but this truth, which they had received from divine revelation, they distorted by combining with it their own wishes and counsels. Their

1 See Bengelii Gnomon in loc. and compare Heinrich's Acta Apostolorum, T. I. p. 125.

advice contradicted what Paul declares concerning himself, that he went up to Jerusalem being constrained by the Spirit to do so, *δεδεμενος τῳ πνευματι* "per Spiritum cogor, et quasi vinculis constringor, ut non possim non Hierosolymam proficisci," I am compelled by the Spirit, and as it were held in chains, so that I cannot avoid going to Jerusalem.[1] Morus thinks Paul is to be understood thus: "Parare se molestiis animum debere, non autem propter molestias plane effugere locum," that he ought to prepare his mind to encounter difficulties, but not through fear of those difficulties to avoid the place.[2] Those Tyrian prophets were persons to whom God now and then revealed something, but who did not enjoy the constant guidance and teaching of the Spirit of God,—they were such prophets as Paul mentions 1 Cor. 14: 29, 30. comp. 12: 10. From the danger of thus adulterating the revelations which they received from God, the apostles were preserved by the Spirit of God, their inseparable assistant. This Spirit, for example, prevented them from using expressions suggested by the additions which their reasoning might make to the revelations they received from God. He excited in them a suspicion of all such ideas as originated from themselves, and thus led them to select other expressions, which, whilst they accorded with their own ideas and habits of expression, harmonized perfectly with the truth, and with the purposes of the divine Spirit. In this way, it may be seen, that while the Spirit of God prevented any false propositions or expressions from escaping the apostles, opportunity was afforded, even in the communication of truths immediately inspired, for each apostle to manifest that peculiarity of thought and expres-

1 See Kypke's Observat. Sacr. on the passage.

2 "Mori Versio et Explicatio Actorum apostolicorum," ed. Dindorf. p. 250. Hess, (in his "History and writings of the apostles of Jesus," Vol. II. p. 386. note 5, 1810,) limits the advice of the Tyrian prophets (Acts 21: 4) to a mere *delay* of Paul's journey for a few days.

sion by which he was distinguished from the others. Certain it is, that as far as the credibility of the apostolical instructions is concerned, it is a matter of perfect indifference, whether we believe that the Spirit of God suggested the very words in which those instructions were uttered or written, or whether the Spirit only guided and aided them, from time to time, so far as was necessary. The former supposition, however, does not seem to comport with the diversity of style and arrangement in the apostolical writings.[1]

NOTE. In the Dissertation of the author, which has already been quoted, "On the miraculous spiritual gifts of the Corinthians," (in Paulus' Neuem Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Literatur, Th. III. p. 331—334), it is remarked, that the *διακρισις πνευματων* the gift of discerning spirits, mentioned in 1 Cor. 14: 29. 12: 10, consisted in an ability to discover whether the prophets, in their oral instructions, (*λαλουντες* 14: 29), adhered strictly to the revelations they had received, or whether they mingled with them something inconsistent with the intentions of the Spirit that had given them the revelation, and who was now active in the minds of the *διακρινοντων* the discerners or the discriminators of real revelations. Thus the discerner, *ὁ διακρινων*, discriminated among the *πνευματα* the gifts of the prophets, what was really prophecy (*προφητεια*) from what was a human addition. In this manner, by means of the *διακρισεων πνευματων*, whatever God revealed to a prophet of this class, became exactly known. From these prophets *προφηταις*, the apostles were distinguished by the

---

[1] Töllner über die göttliche Eingebung der Heiligen Schrift, § 59—65. Crusius' Theologia prophetica, Th. I. § 42. No. 17—20. Köppen, "The Bible a work of divine wisdom, Pt. II. p. 397. Roos' "Evidence that the whole Bible is inspired," p. 139. Plank's Introduction to the Theological Sciences, Pt. I. p. 404—409.

possession of *many* spiritual gifts united (1 Cor. 14: 16), and by their infallibility in the exhibition of the views which were given them.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

2 Cor. 7: 9—11, κατα θεον. κατα here indicates the *author* of the sorrow mentioned, or the agent by whom it was produced. But in v. 8, Paul mentions himself as the author of their sorrow (ε γ ω ελυπησα ὑμας); of course he maintains, that he, acting under a divine impulse (auctore Deo) had occasioned them this sorrow.

§ 12.

Divine authority of the writings of Mark and Luke.

Although what has been said in the preceding paragraphs (§ 9—11) relative to the extraordinary guidance of the apostles, cannot be predicated of the writings of Mark and Luke; the fact that their statements are historically true and entitled to our confidence, is established by the evidence stated in § 5. It appears also that we may justly ascribe to them divine authority. For (1) the apostle Peter read and sanctioned the Gospel of Mark, which was written under his superintendance. And, in like manner, the historical works of Luke, one of which relates principally to the apostle Paul, doubtless received the perusal and the sanction of this apostle (2). Finally, the apostle John expressed the wish, that the christians should have in their possession, the Gospels of Mark and Luke, as well as his own and that of the apostle Matthew, (3) and that the two former should be used in connexion with the latter(4).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The sanction of an apostle must, necessarily, confer divine authority on any work on which it was bestowed, though not written by an apostle. Matt. 16 : 19. compare Töllner sup. cit. § 10.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

As the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the apostles were written, at the time when Paul was prisoner at Rome and Luke

resident with him, it is highly probable that Paul must have read and sanctioned them.[1] Compare supra § 5. Illust. 2, 6.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Those who doubt whether the apostolical Gospels, so far as they are *narratives of facts*, are clothed with divine authority, cannot justly appeal in support of their opinion to John 14: 26, ὁ παρακλητος ὑπομνησει ὑμας παντα ἁ ειπον ὑμιν the Monitor will remind you of all things which I have spoken to you. For, when Christ here specifies the things which he *said*, he does not thereby exclude the things which he *did*, or the *events* which took place; but it was his aim to show the close connexion between *his* doctrines and the instructions of the παρακλητος, the future constant guide and supporter of his disciples; he wished to show that *his* instructions were the groundwork of the future instructions of the Spirit, and that the latter coincided perfectly with the former (John 16: 13—15). Moreover, according to this very passage, the παρακλητος was to teach the apostles *every thing* which was necessary for the discharge of the duties of their office, διδαξει παντα; he therefore undoubtedly taught them the *history* of Jesus, so far as they were not fully acquainted with it, and so far as their office, in the discharge of the duties of which they were to be constantly supported by the παρακλητος, required them to promulgate this history. But that the history of Jesus formed an essential part of the apostolical doctrine,[2] is evident from the gospel of John, in which the truth of the doctrines inculcated, is proved historically, or by appealing to the actions of Jesus; indeed this Gos-

1 "On the Object of St. John, p. 273.

2 See 1 Cor. 15: 3—7. compare § 5. Illust. 6. Hess' "Bibliothek of sacred history," on "The importance of studying the history contained in the Bibl.," and "The Revision of the study of biblical history," p. 213, 98. 111. 236 &c. 246 &c.

pel itself is not merely a historical, but a doctrinal and polemical book ;[1] for the primary object of John's Gospel was, to establish the fact that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (John 20: 31). For this purpose, St. John selected the most remarkable from among the numerous miracles of Jesus, or those which were best adapted to establish the declarations of Jesus concerning himself, in consequence of their greater publicity, and the express avowal of the object of them which accompanied their performance. At the very commencement of the Gospel, the doctrine is distinctly proposed, for the proof of which the subsequent narrative was composed. And the first epistle of John, which properly constitutes the second part of his Gospel, developes the inferences from the argumentation contained in the Gospel.[2] The facts related in the Gospels are therefore inti-

1 In the first chapter of the first part of the work on "the Object of St. John," it is shown (§ 3—19), that this Gospel was written against the disciples of John the Baptist and the Cerinthians. In the second chapter of the same Part, the historical objet of this Gospel is developed. Comp. Hug's Introd. N. Test. Pt. II. p. 136. Flatt "Dissertatio, qua variae, de Antichristis et Pseudo-prophetis in prima Johannis epistola notatis, sententiae modesto examini subjiciuntur," p. 36, Tübing. 1809. Literary notices of works on the polemical object of the Gospel of John, are found in Hänlein's Einleitung, Th. II. 2te hälfte, S. 425—438; in Wegscheider's Einleitung in das Evangelium des Johannes, S. 202—237; and in Eichhorn's Einleitung in das N. T. B. II. S. 189—211.

2 Various representations of the doctrinal object of the Gospel of John, may be seen in the following works: Hänlein's Introd. to N. T. vol. II. Pt. 2. p. 414—418. Herder, "On the Son of God and Saviour of the world, according to the Gospel of John," Riga, 1797. Paulus, De consilio ac fine Johann. Apostol. in scribendis suis Evangelicis Commentariis proposito (Introd. N. T. capp. selectt. N. III. § II — XXII. Schmidt's Introduction to N. T. Pt. I. p. 153 &c. Wegscheider's Complete Introduction to the Gospel of John, p. 246 &c. Göttingen, 1806. Hug's Introd. to N. T. Pt. II. p. 133 &c. Eichhorn's Introd. N. T. vol. II. p. 184 &c. Agreeably to Herder's opinion, with which Eichhorn in substance agrees, "John wished to extend and enlarge the idea of the Messiah, whom the first three Gospels had represented as a Jewish Messiah. In accordance with the Palestine Gospels, he represented Christ as the Saviour of the world, and showed in what sense he was the Son of God and the source of eternal happiness. Thus he gave a practical aspect to the

mately connected with the doctrines, and highly necessary to a right understanding and to the proof of them. Finally, Jesus himself and his apostles attributed divine authority to the whole Old Testament, the greater part of which is historical, and by no means superior to the apostolical writings. Matth. 11 : 9—11. 2 Tim. 3: 14, 15. See § 13 infra.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The testimony of St. John in favour of the writings of Mark and Luke.

In the work on the Object of John's Gospel, I advanced the assertion, that John had the other Gospels before him when composing his own, and that he wished those Gospels to be used in connexion with his. To this assertion I still adhere. Michaelis,[1] Griesinger,[2] and Hug[3] are of the same opinion.[4] The objection to this opinion, stated in the "Contributions for the promotion of rational views of religion" (No. XIV. p. 10), and in "An attempt to illustrate the history of the Jewish and Chris-

old historical Gospel." Compare Kleuker's Letters to a pious female friend, concerning Herder's work, entitled, "The Son of God and Saviour of the world, according to the Gospel of John." Münster and Leipsic, 1802.

1 Introd. N. T. § 161. 4th ed.

2 Introd. N. T. p. 86 &c.

3 Introd. N. T. Pt. II. p. 144—154.

4 Paulus (Comment. on John, vol. I. p. 252) thinks John supposed his readers at least acquainted with Luke's Gospel, and Eichhorn (Introd. to N. T. vol. II. § 159) supposes he considered them as acquainted with the Protevangelium. Wegscheider (Introd. to the Gospel of John, p. 244) admits that John was acquainted with the other three Gospels, or with their original source; and that he supposed his readers to be acquainted with them; yet with this limitation, that the apostle depended on an indistinct recollection of those other Gospels, and did not intend to make his Gospel specifically a supplement to them. Schmidt, in his Historico-critical Introd. to the N. T. Pt. I. p. 146, proposes the adventurous hypothesis, "that John perhaps intended to complete Marcion's Gospel, which had been brought from Asia into the west; because the greater part of the narratives which John has in common with the other three evangelists, were always wanting in Marcion's Gospel, and often in that only."

tian Scripture canons" (Vol. II. 192), is answered in the Dissert. "on the Occasion and object of the catholic epistles," note 125. The objection urged in the work of Korrodi, against the opinion that John had the three other Gospels before him, is this: "We have every reason to believe, that if this had been the case, he would have explained many of the apparent contradictions in them." But this objection is fully met by the general remark, contained in the Dissert. de epistol. cathol. occasione et consilio, Note 125. "Those circumstances, which it is necessary for the reader to suppose, in order to solve apparent contradictions, were so familiar to the writer, who was an eyewitness of the incidents which he relates, that he never thought of those apparent contradictions which are so observable by a reader who is unacquainted with those explanatory circumstances." Yet in chap. 18: 25, John actually explains and harmonizes Matth. 26: 71 (*αλλη παιδισκη* another maid), and Mark 14: 69 (*ἡ παιδισκη—παλιν* the maid—again), and Luke 22: 58 (*αλλος* another); by remarking that *several* persons assailed Peter, *ειπον αυτῳ* THEY said to him.[1]

The following is a summary of the evidence for the position advanced in the beginning of this Illustration, as it is stated in the work "On the object of the Gospel of John," § 52, 53, 70, 71.—It is indeed an erroneous saying, found in Eusebius[2] and Jerome,[3] that John explicitly *approved and sanctioned* the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke (*αποδεξασθαι αυτα, αληθειαν αυτοις επιμαρτυρησαντα*); but

1. The internal arrangement of John's Gospel evinces, that he *supposed his readers acquainted* with other Gospels; and moreover gives us some reason to believe, that those other Gospels were exactly the three which we possess. For, *first*, ma-

---

See Note 4 on the preceding page. [2] Hist. Eccles. III, 24.

[3] De viris illustribus, s. v. Johannes.

ny of the things which he supposes to be already known, and which therefore he does not repeat, are precisely such as are contained in the other Gospels; e. g. the imprisonment of John the Baptist (John 3 : 24), the manner in which Jesus procured a young ass (12 : 14, 16); and in 21 : 2 he assumes as known to his readers, that there was a stone before the sepulchre of Jesus; and that there were other women at the grave, beside Mary Magdalene, *ουκ οιδαμεν* WE know not. Michaelis, in his Introduction to the New Testament, adduces other additional evidence of the same position.[1] *Again*, he omits some narratives which are contained in the other Gospels, and which would have been very serviceable to his polemical object; e. g. the explanation of Jesus to the disciples of John (Matth. 11 : 2 &c.); the miracles at the death of Jesus (Matth. 27 : 45, 51); the supernatural conception of Jesus, recorded by Luke and Matthew; his ascension to heaven — which, however, is referred to in ch. 6 : 62. 20 : 17.—Michaelis adds the following to the list of incidents omitted by John: the decapitation of John the Baptist; the election of the twelve apostles; the transfiguration of Jesus; and the institution of the sacred Supper. In other parts of his narration, he omits important circumstances which are recorded by the other evangelists; e. g. the miraculous cure of the ear of the highpriest's servant (Luke 22 : 51, comp. John 18 : 10); the last exclamation of Jesus (Luke 23: 16); and the loud voice with which it was uttered (Mark 15: 37). — In cases where the connexion of his subject would not permit him entirely to omit a narrative contained in the other evangelists, he gives a very brief sketch of it. Compare John 18: 39, 40, with Luke 23: 17—23 and Mark 5 : 6—14. *Finally*, he contributes materials which render the others more

[1] Pt. II. § 161. e. g. John 1: 32—34, where the history of the baptism of Jesus is presupposed to be known.

perfect and complete; e. g. the name *Malchus* ch. 18 : 10 (In this chapter, v. 24 should precede v. 15, according to the order of events; hence απεστειλε (v. 24) must be rendered, *miserat* had sent). In general, the greater part of the discourses and transactions of our Lord fall within this remark. See Griesinger, Hug, and Eichhorn,[1] as above quoted.

2. As it is certain from Irenaeus, that the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were, at an early period, used in connexion with the Gospel of John, and by those very churches in Asia Minor among which John resided till his death, and in the midst of which he wrote his Gospel; it is extremely probable that these three Gospels, and no others, were those which John supposed his readers to be acquainted with. For had other Gospels been referred to by him, they would not, for this very reason, so soon have lost their authority among those churches.

3. At the time when John wrote his Gospel, the other three could have been known in Asia, for a long time; for the Gospels of Matthew and Mark were probably written about the time spoken of Acts 11 : 12, and of course while John yet resided in Jerusalem (Gal. 2 : 9. comp. Acts ch. 15). And the Gospel of Luke might easily have been known in Asia previous to the composition of John's Gospel. § 5. Illust. 6.

4. But if John did presuppose in his readers a knowledge of the other three Gospels, and in the composition of his own evidently acknowledged their authority, as we have stated above (1); this is a tacit and virtual approbation of them all, and of course of the Gospels of Mark and Luke, which is quite as decisive as an express sanction of them.

---

[1] The objections urged by the reviewer of Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Test. (in the Haller Lit. Zeit. J. 1811. N. 185. S. 539 &c.) against the hypothesis, that John supposed his readers acquainted with other Gospels, had been before advanced, in part, in Wegscheider's Introd. p. 242.

§ 13.

Divine authority of the Old Testament.

The very same kind of arguments which proves the divine authority of the writings of Mark and Luke (§ 12), will also prove the divine authority of the books of the Old Testament(1); for they have alike received the sanction of men whose credentials were divine. As it has been proved (§§ 6—11,) that the religious instructions of Jesus and his apostles are of divine authority, it follows that *all* their declarations, and of course their assertions relative to the Old Testament (2), must be received implicitly as being accordant with truth. But Jesus and his apostles not only declare that God is the author of the Mosaic Laws (3), but they receive other parts of the writings of Moses as true (4); not excepting his account of events which took place before his birth (5); and they assume that the books of Moses were written at the special instance (6) of God, and under his particular guidance (7). They assert that the Pentateuch (8), and the sacred books of the Jews in general (9), contain divine predictions (10),—(not the conjectures and fictions of men) (11),—which are therefore (12) prophecies of indisputable certainty (13). And not only the prophecies, but the whole of the Old Testament, all its moral instructions (14), its narratives (15), and in short, the whole contents of the book, whether prophetic, doctrinal, or historical, and even the very expressions used (16), they assume as indisputably true (17). And this claim of the Old Testament to our implicit credence, they found on the divinity of the book (18).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The books of the New testament were reckoned equally sacred with those of the Old Testament, even in the apostolic age.

It is evident from the declarations of Jesus and his apostles, that they ascribed divine authority to *writings*, no less than to oral communications. Hence it is the more improbable that the promises of Jesus, and the declarations of the apostles (§ 9, 10), as to the divine influence and aid which they had while instructing men, were confined to a *part* of their teaching, namely the oral, to the exclusion of the written. On the contrary, we know that even in the apostolical age, the writings of the New Testament were held in as high estimation as those of the Old. Thus: I. James, in his second chapter (v. 8), quotes a Gospel, and seems to have the passage Matth. 22: 39, 36, in his view. In other passages also he seems to have his eye on the Gospel of Matthew; compare James 2: 13 with Matth. 24: 41—45, 34—40. James 1: 22 with Matth. 7: 24 &c. James 3: 11, 12 with Matth. 7: 15 &c. James 5: 10 with Matth. 5: 12. James 5: 12 with Matth. 5; 34—37.[1] II. In chap. 4: 5, James quotes an epistle of Paul under the title of ἡ γραφη. He seems to allude to Gal. 5: 17 &c.; and in the next verse he quotes, in conjunction with it, a passage from the Old Testament (Prov. 3: 34) with the expression διαλεγει (i. e. ἡ γραφη, which must be supplied from the preceding verse). The epistle to the Galatians and the Proverbs are therefore equally accounted parts of the "Holy Scriptures."[2] That Gal. 5: 17 (compared with v. 20, 21) is probably the passage to which James here refers, is proved in § III. of the dissertation just referred to in the margin. For there is no passage in the Old Testament to which

---

[1] See Dissert. on the Epistle of James, Note 62. Opuscul. acad. vol. II. p. 25.

[2] See Dissert. on the Catholic Epistles, Note 48.

James could possibly have referred; but his citation agrees very well with Gal. 5: 17 &c. The words of Paul *το πνευμα επιθυμει κατα της σαρκος* the spirit lusteth against the flesh, are indeed expressed by James, thus: *προς φθονον επιποθει το πνευμα* the spirit lusteth to envy; yet Paul in the above passage, not only mentions *φθονον* (envy) among the *εργοις της σαρκος* works of the flesh (v. 19, 20), but the whole passage contains an exhortation to brotherly love (v. 13), and a reprehension of envy (v. 15.)[1] III. Polycarp denominates the book of Psalms and the epistle to the Ephesians alike, the Sacred Scriptures. He says, "Ut his scripturis dictum est: Irascimini et nolite peccare. Et sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram,[2] i. e. as it is said in these Scriptures: Be ye angry and sin not; and let not the sun go down upon your wrath. The first quotation, irascimini, is from Psalm 4: 5, and the latter, et sol non &c. from Eph. 4: 26, and both are denominated "Scripture." In the New Apology for the Revelation, it is proved that there is a spurious addition to the epistle of Polycarp (§ 13), which Eusebius does not seem to have read; but that the epistle itself is on that account by no means to be regarded as spurious.[3]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The declarations of Jesus and the apostles relative to the Old Testament, are not an accommodation to popular opinion and prejudice.

Those who consider the declarations of Christ and his apostles concerning the Old Testament, as also many of their dec-

---

1 See the different explanations of this passage, in Pott. epistol. cathol. Fasc. I. Excurs. III. p. 247—270. C. C. Flatt, Spicilegium Observat. in epist. Jacobi catholicam, p. 35—42, Tüb. 1806.

2 § XII. Pol. Epist.

3 See p. 179 of the Apology. Compare Schmidt's Kirchengeschichte, 1 Th. S. 213.

larations on other subjects, as being an accommodation," (that is, as a speaking in accordance with the erroneous opinions of their hearers, who had too exalted ideas of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and as not expressing precisely and truly their own opinions,) not only make a very arbitrary supposition, but they violate the fundamental and unexceptionable principles of interpretation, and deny that authority and credibility which we are compelled to ascribe to both Jesus and his apostles. But in the present case, there is an appropriate argument against the supposition of such accommodation, namely, that precisely the same language is used by Jesus respecting the Old Test. when conversing with his apostles (Matth. 26 : 24, 31. Luke 22 : 37. 24 : 44—47), and even in his prayers to his heavenly Father (e. g. John 17: 12); and likewise by Paul, when addressing his confidential friend Timothy, whom he terms *ισοψυχον* [1] of the same mind with himself; and also when addressing those who were opposed to Judaism.[2] See 2 Tim. 3: 15, 16. 1 Cor. 9: 8—10. 10: 1—11. 14: 21, 34. 15: 3, 4, 25—27.[3]

The principal arguments against the supposed Accommodation of Jesus and his apostles, and which are fully stated and defended in the works mentioned at the close of this illustration, are the following :

I. The moral character of Jesus and his apostles, renders such a supposition inadmissible.

---

1 Phil. 2: 20—22.

2 In the Dissert. on the epistles to the Corinthians (§ 9), it is remarked, that these epistles, and especially the first, were addressed to that part of the Corinthian church, which were "of Paul," and "of Apollos" (1 Cor. 3: 4), and which was not the Judaizing party.

3 Compare Reinhard's Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik, herausgegeben von Berger 1801. s. 60 f.

II. The supposition, that Jesus and his apostles propagated falsehoods under the garb of truth, is overturned by the fact that miracles evinced their high authority as teachers.

III. No sure criterion can be given which shall enable us to distinguish between those of their declarations which they believed themselves, and those in which they accommodated themselves to the erroneous notions of the Jews. The Scriptures no where make a distinction between what is universally true; and what is only local or temporary. The theory of accommodation involves the whole of revelation in uncertainty.

IV. Many of those coincidences between the instructions of Christ and the Jewish opinions, which have commonly been referred to accommodation, cannot even be proved to be historically true. The Rabbinical writings which are appealed to, are of more recent origin than the age of Christ and his apostles; the works of Philo and Josephus do not uniformly exhibit the ideas which were prevalent among the Jews resident in Palestine. Moreover, the representations contained in these works, and also in some apocryphal books, differ in a variety of respects from the doctrines of the New Testament. If, however, some of the instructions of Jesus and his apostles, did coincide with the popular opinions of the Jews, it by no means follows that they must therefore have been erroneous. So far as these Jewish opinions were correct, they were worthy of the approbation of Jesus. And the providence of God may, by previous intimations of them, have paved the way for the reception of the peculiar doctrines of christianity.

V. The necessity for such accommodation on the part of Jesus and his apostles, cannot be proved.

The principal authors against the scheme of accommodation, are Storr, on the Historical Sense of the N. T. § IX—XXI, 1778. Opusc. academ. Vol. I. No. 1. His Dissertation,

the apostles and ours did not quote to the old testament for the sake of expression but as of divine authority

on the Object of the death of Christ, in the epistle to the Hebrews, § 10.—"Confidential Letters on the subject of Religion," letter 5th, p. 159 &c. 3d edit. Hauff's Remarks on Jesus' manner of teaching, 2d edit. 1798. Heringa, On the manner of teaching practised by Jesus and his apostles, Offenbach, 1792. "Reason and Revelation; for reflecting christians," by Baumgarten Crusius, Pt. I. p. 204 &c. Plank's Introduction to the theological sciences, Pt. I. p. 401 &c. Less' Letters on certain theological subjects, especially on the principle of accommodation, 1797. Lang, über die Principien der Beurtheilung des Lokalen und Temporellen in der christlichen Religions-Lehre; in Flatt's Magazine für christliche Dogmatik und Moral, St. 7. S. 1—67. St. 8. S. 99—140. Meyer's Attempt to determine the question: How far are the doctrines and precepts of the New Testament merely of a local and temporary character, and how far are they to be regarded as universally and permanently binding? Hanover, 1806. (This last work, however, is often vague and indistinct in its representations; compare the Tüb. gel. Anzeig. St. 7. S. 49 &c. 1807.) Tzschirner's Memorabilia for the studies and pastoral conduct of ministers, Vol. I. pt. 2, Leipsic, 1810, (in the "Continuation of the exhibition and critical examination of the doctrinal systems in the protestant churches," p. 13 &c.)

The doctrine of accommodation, but with numerous limitations, has recently been defended at full length, as being deducible from moral principles, by Vogel, in the second number of his "Aufsätze theologischen Inhalts," Nurenburg und Altdorf S. 54 &c. 1799. and in his Manual of Practical divinity, § 198, 1803. (Compare, in reply, the Tüb. gel. Anzeig. p. 803, for 1800; and p. 702 &c. of that for 1805. Tüb. Mag. St. 8. S. 120—128. St. 13. S. 64.) See also Schott's "Journal for clergymen, for the promotion of a revival of religion by means of the

ministerial office;" Vol. II. for 1811. No. 1. pt. 3. (Reflections on the relation between Rationalism and Supernaturalism, p. 96.)

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Authority of the Mosaic Laws.

See Matth. 15 : 4. Mark 7 : 9, 10, 13. and 1 Cor. 9: 8. In the latter passage the words *κατα ανθρωπον λαλω*, stand opposed to *ὁ νομος ταυτα λεγει*; and the idea which the apostle aims to express, is this: "the commands of the Mosaic Law are not human commands." So in Gal. 1:11, *κατα ανθρωπον* by man, is opposed to a higher revelation from Jesus Christ (v. 12). Kypke (on 1 Cor. 12 : 8) has proved by an induction of numerous examples, that *κατα*, especially in the phrase *κατα θεον* from God, signifies *per*, by or from.

In Heb. 9 : 8, the same Mosaic Law is ascribed to the *πνευμα ἁγιον* or Holy Spirit.[1] Nor is this contradicted by Heb. 2: 2, where the Laws of Moses, are termed *ὁ δι' αγγελων λαληθεις λογος* the precepts communicated by angels; for it was God who spake by the angels.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The authority of the other writings of Moses.

Compare Matth. 22 : 31 &c. with Exod. 3: 6; and John 3: 14 with Numb. 21: 8, 9. In 1 Cor. 10 : 1—11, is explicit reference to much of the Mosaic history in Exodus and Numbers.

---

1 See the author's Commentary on the Hebrews, in loc. Note t.

2 See the above cited Commentary, in loc. Note 9.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The authority of Moses' narrative of events prior to his birth.

Matth. 19 : 4—6, containing an account of the creation of man and woman, from Gen. chap. 2. Acts 3: 25, which cites the promise to Abraham, recorded Gen. 12: 3. Rom. 4 : 2—24, concerning the faith of Abraham, as described Gen. 15: 6. 1 Tim. 2 : 13, 14, the narrative of the fall of our first parents, from Gen. ch. 3. 1 Cor. 11: 8, 9, the creation of the first man and woman. 1 Pet. 3: 20. 2 Pet. 2: 5—7, the history of Noah, of Sodom and of Lot, from Gen. ch. 6——8. Heb. 6 : 13 &c. comp. Gen. 22 : 16. Heb. 11: 3—22. comp. Gen. 1: 4—6, 12, 21, 22, 27, 47, 48, 50.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

God the author of the Pentateuch.

Gal. 3: 8, *προειδουσα ἡ γραφη, ὁτι εκ πιστεως δικαιοῖ τα εθνη ὁ θεος* "the *author* of the Holy Scriptures, who foresaw that God *(he himself)* would pronounce the heathen just, through faith, gave Abraham the promise, Through thee shall all the nations be blessed." *Γραφη* here signifies the author of the Holy Scriptures, agreeably to the well known figure of speech by which the effect is put for the cause.[1] *Ὁ θεος* stands in place of the pronoun *αὐτος*, just as in Hebrew, instead of using the pronoun, the noun is reduplicated. Agreeably to this passage, therefore, the author of the Holy Scriptures is the same with him who gave Abraham that promise, namely God, Gen. 12: 1, 3. 18: 17, 18.[2]

---

1 Observv. p. 15. 2 Observv. § XXIII, compare also 1 Cor. 1: 21, and the passage of Arrian, which Raphael adduces in commenting on 2 Tim. 1: 18.

That the Old Testament was written by the particular influfluence of God, is evident also from Rom. 4 : 23 &c. 1 Cor. 10: 11.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

In Gal. 3: 16, Paul lays peculiar stress upon the use of the word *σπερμα* in the singular number. For, a plural word, e. g. בָּנִים sons, might have been used instead of the Hebrew word זֶרַע seed. But God in his wisdom saw fit to use the singular זֶרַע; because the blessings which were to flow from Abraham's posterity to all the nations of the earth, were dependant on a single individual.[1] In Gal. 4 : 21, Paul treats a portion of history taken from Gen. ch. 21, allegorically; manifestly assuming it to be a fact, that the first book of Moses, in addition to its literal meaning, had also an allegorical sense; and therefore that God, in the narrative of this event, intended to give a symbolical prophecy of a more remote part of that very extensive plan, the accomplishment of which was begun in the history of Abraham.[2] A similar example is found in Heb. ch. 7; compare the author's note on Heb. 7: 3.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The Prophetic character of the Mosaic writings.

This is recognized by Christ; see John 5: 39, 46, 47. For agreeably to the context, the words *τας γραφας* in v. 39, necessarily refer to the Mosaic writings.[3] Compare also John 19: 36 with Exod. 12: 46. In note (a) of the Comment. on Heb. 10:

---

1 Vide Commentatio de Protevangelio, 1789, p. 19. note 5. Opuscul. acad. Vol. II. p. 431.

2 See Commentary on the Hebrews, Introduction, p. LXIX.

3 Compare Sextro, Expositio Sermonis Jesu, John 5:39. coll. v. 46, 47, p. 29, Helmstadt, 1792.

7, it is proved, in opposition to Rau,[1] that the evangelist John certainly intended to represent the fact that the bones of the crucified Redeemer were not broken, as a fulfilment of the Scriptures relating to him. Consequently, that the precept of Moses relative to the Paschal Lamb, must have been intended by God, the author of this law, as a type of the death of Jesus. And even admitting that Moses did not himself understand the meaning of this typical prophecy, it is sufficient that the Spirit of God gave an authentic explanation of it by a later messenger, when the time to which it referred and in which it was to be accomplished, had arrived.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

See Matth. 11 : 13. Acts 26 : 22, 23. The expression *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται και Μωϋσης* the law and the prophets and Moses, signifies the whole Old Testament. Comp. § 14. Illust. 2. Acts 13 : 29, *ἁπαντα τα περι αυτου γεγραμμενα* all things which were written concerning him ; comp. v. 32—35.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

The ancients regarded the ascription of one's own conjectures and opinions to God, as an evidence of a false prophet ; and as inconsistent with the dignity of a true prophet and messenger of God. Jer. 23: 16, 21, 25 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Acts 3: 18, 21, *θεος—προκατηγγειλε (ελαλησε) δια στοματος παντων των (ἁγιων) προφητων αὐτου* God—announced beforehand (spake), by the mouth of all his (holy) prophets. 1 Pet. 1: 10—12, *το εν αυτοις (προφηταις) πνευμα Χριστου προ-*

---

[1] In his Examination of the Types, p. 166 &c. comp. Kuinöl Comment. in Johann. 1812, p. 675.

μαρτυρομενον the spirit of Christ which was in them (the prophets) testified. 2 Pet. 1: 21, *ὑπο πνευματος ἁγιου φερομενοι ελαλησαν ἁγιοι θεου ανθρωποι* holy men of God spake under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; comp. Heb. 10: 15. Matth. 1: 22. 22: 43. Rom. 1: 2.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

Acts 2: 30 &c. *προφητης ὑπαρχων* because (David) was a prophet &c.; compare 2 Pet. 1: 20, 21, *πασα προφητεια γραφης, ιδιας επιλυσεως ου γινεται· ου γαρ κ.τ.λ.* "no one can render the prophecies of Scripture invalid, (dissolvere, irritum reddere,) for this reason, that they were not given by the will of man, but by the Holy Spirit." That this explanation of the words of Peter, is more probable than the common one, namely, that "the prophecies of Scripture cannot be interpreted by man," is maintained in the Dissertation on the Catholic Epistles,[1] and on the following grounds: 1. The reason assigned in v. 21, would not, on the latter interpretation, accord with the assertion of v. 20; for it does not necessarily follow, that a prophecy cannot be explained by men, because it was given by inspiration. 2. It is not true, that no prophecy has been explained by man until after its completion. 3. To supply *ανθρωπων* or *προφητων* after *ιδιας*, would be a harsh ellipsis. These words are therefore better explained thus: "Be assured, that no prophecy of Scripture can be frustrated by your opinions or ridicule," comp. ch. 3: 2, 3; *ιδιας* stands for *ιδιας ὑμων*, as in 2 Pet. 3: 17. 1 Pet. 3: 1. The primary signification of *επιλυσις*, is *dissolutio;* and the meaning *explicatio*, is

[1] p. 27, 28. Opusc. acad. Vol. II. p. 392.

only a deduced one.[1] The following different modifications[2] of this interpretation have been advanced: 1. No prophecy can be explained by the prophets themselves.[3] 2. The prophetic writings cannot, like other writings, be interpreted by the unassisted powers of the reader,—the aids of the Spirit are necessary, to enable us to understand the instructions of the Spirit.[4] 3. No prophecy can be explained by itself,[5] or without comparing it with the events.

[NOTE. In addition to the interpretations of this text, given by our author, the following might be added, some of which are perhaps not without plausibility.

I. No prophecy is of *arbitrary* interpretation. God is the author of the prophecies; and they have a definite meaning, and must not be distorted into conformity with our peculiar views—here *ιδιας* refers to *ανθρωπων*.

II. No prophecy is of *separate detached* interpretation. God is the author of *all* the prophecies; and hence they cannot contradict each other, and must be explained accordantly.

III. All the prophecies are not to be understood according to their own (*literal*) meaning. Some of them had a proximate

---

1 On the prophecies of the O. T. comp. Seiler, "De vaticiniorum causis atque finibus," Opusc. theol. I. 1793, p. 1 &c. "The Prophecies and their fulfilment shown from Scripture," 1794. Jahn's Introduction to the Old Testament, Pt. II. No 2, 2d edit. Vienna, 1803, p. 323—400. Ewald's work entitled, "The religious doctrines of the Bible considered in reference to our spiritual necessities," Vol. I. 1812, p. 228 &c. 248 &c. Various works on the prophecies of the Old Test. in general, and on particular prophecies, are quoted in Beck's Commentarii historici decretorum religionis christianae, Lipsiae, 1801, p. 75—83.

2 Various other explanations of this passage, are found in Pott, Epist. Cathol. Vol. II. p. 206 &c.

3 Knapp, Scripta varii argumenti, p. 21.

4 Stoltz, Comment. in loc.

5 Griesbach, Comm. in loc. 2 Pet. 1: 16—21. Pt. II. p. 4. &c. Morus' Praelect. in Jacobi et Petri epistolas, p. 207. Schott, Novi Testamenti vers. Latin.

completion in prior events, but were intended by God their author, to refer to the future Messiah, who has now come.

IV. The writings of the prophets are not of *their* (the prophets') *own* inspiration (or revelation, propriae patefactionis). The prophets did not communicate their own views, but the counsels of God.— Neither of the three first versions, nor any of those stated by our author, seem properly to accord with the context. This last interpretation therefore appears to be entitled to a decided preference, in this respect. The only question is, whether it agrees with the usus loquendi of the word *επιλυσις*. Its radical meaning is admittted to be *dissolutio*, solution ; when applied to things unknown, it must mean, to remove doubts and to communicate new ideas or knowledge. When applied to the explanation of written records, (which, if I mistake not, it rarely is,) it must signify, to disclose their meaning. Now, does custom confine the use of the word to those cases, in which the removal of obscurity and the communication of new ideas, are the result of mere natural ability ; or is it ever applied to cases, in which the person giving the solution is aided by special divine influence ? If the latter, then in such cases, it signifies revelation ; and may be so used in the text under consideration. Let us now examine this point. Mark uses it (4: 34) to signify the solutions which our Lord gave to his disciples, in private, of the parables which he had delivered in public. The LXX, as well as Aquila, use it in Gen. ch. 40, to express the explanation given by Joseph of the dreams of the butler and baker. The LXX use it to translate פָּתַר, which, according to Gesenius, signifies auslegen, deuten (von träumen), to explain, to interpret (dreams). There is a somewhat peculiar use of the word, in Symmachus' version of Hosea 3: 4, where it is used for תְּרָפִים, by which Gesenius understands "a kind of household gods or penates ;" but which the LXX

translate *δηλων*, and Luther, heiligthum; the Vulgate and English retain the original word. Among these, the case of Joseph is directly in point. When Joseph asked the king's officers, Wherefore look ye so sadly to day? they answered, We have dreamed a dream, and there is no interpreter of it; i. e. no one can interpret it. And Joseph said unto them, "Do not interpretations belong to God? tell me them." Here Joseph himself declares, that God alone could impart the knowledge they wished. And from all the circumstances of the case, no one, I should suppose, who believes the inspiration of the Scriptures, can doubt that his interpretation was inspired, that it was a revelation. The usus loquendi will therefore bear us out, in translating *επιλυσεως* revelation or inspiration. *Ιδιας* would then refer to *προφητων*, elliptically suppressed; and the version would harmonize perfectly with the whole context, thus: "We have not believed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ; but were eye witnesses of his majesty, and heard the testimony of God the Father in his favour, saying, by a voice from heaven, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; and we have also the prophecies which are now confirmed (being fulfilled by the coming of Jesus Christ.—*βεβαιοτερον*; see Mark 16:20. 1 Cor. 1: 6.) whereunto ye do well to give heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts; knowing this especially, "that the writings of the prophets, contained in the Scriptures, are not of their own (the prophets') inspiration; for the prophecy came not, in old time, by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." S.]

ILLUSTRATION 13.

See Luke 24: 25—27, 44—46. 22: 37. Matth. 26: 54. Acts 2: 24—31. The prophecies of the Old Testament must

necessarily be fulfilled in Christ *εδει τελεσθηναι, πληρωθηναι*, and for this reason, that they were of indisputable certainty.

ILLUSTRATION 14.

The moral instructions of the Old Testament, acknowledged in the New.

The phrase *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται* the law and the prophets, in Matth. 5 : 17—19, signifies, the moral precepts of the Old Testament; just as in some other passages, (Luke 16: 6. Matth. 11 : 13), it designates only *a part* of the Old Testament, namely, its prophetical contents. The words *ἑως αν παντα γενηται* until all be fulfilled (v. 18), cannot denote the historical parts of the Old Testament; and that its prophetic parts cannot be alluded to, is evinced by the connexion of the text with what follows it. There are also two other passages in which the phrase *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται* denotes the moral precepts of the Old Testament, Matth. 7: 12. 22: 40.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 15.

The narratives of the Old Testament acknowledged in the New.

The following passages contain narratives taken from the books of Samuel, Kings, Joshua, and Judges: Matth. 12 : 3, 4, 42. Luke 4: 25—27. Rom. 11: 2—4. Acts 13: 20—22. Heb. 11: 30—34.

ILLUSTRATION 16.

The inspiration of the whole Old Testament in general, acknowledged in the New.

In John 10 : 34—36, the declaration of Jesus, that the Scriptures must not be invalidated, refers to the expression,

---

[1] See Dissert. I, in libror. Nov. Testament. historicorum aliquot locos, p. 19, 20.

θεοι εστε ye are Gods, "ye admit that civil officers are gods, (in that sense in which the Scriptures declare it,) and because the Scriptures say so; ought ye not therefore to believe (v. 37, 38), that (in the sense in which I have asserted it in v. 25, 29, 30) I am the Son of God, or one who stands in the most intimate union with him, inasmuch as my works (v. 37 &c.) prove me to be a much greater prophet than the author of the 82d Psalm, who speaks in the name of the Lord?" The context leads to a comparison between the authority of the older prophets (and particularly the author of the 82d Psalm), which was such as to render their declarations obligatory, and the authority of the highest Messenger of God (v. 36). See the work on the Object of John, p. 468 &c. also Roos' Evidence that all the books of the Bible are inspired, p. 74. See also Matth. 8: 17, compared with § 8. Illust. 4 of this work.

The following texts contain examples of the stress, which is laid in the New Testament, on particular expressions in the Old: 1 Cor. 15: 27. Heb. 2: 7—9. 4: 4 (See Storr's Comment. in loc. Note h), and v. 6 (Note l), v. 5, 6 (Note l) ch. 7: 17 (Note y). Heb. 8: 13. Matth. 1: 22. See Lowth's Lectures on Isaiah, published by Koppe, Tom. II. p. 136—138.

ILLUSTRATION 17.

The truth of the Old Testament acknowledged as indisputable, in the New.

The counterpart or opposite of truth, is that which can be overturned δυναται λυθηναι, (John 10: 35). This, Jesus here declares to be impossible, in reference to the whole Old Testament; as Peter (1 ep. 1: 20) declares it, relative to the Old Testament prophecies. Kypke, on this passage, proves that λυειν signifies *irritum reddere*, by an induction of examples from profane writers; and adds, "solvitur verbum Dei, si fal-

sum reprehenditur," the word of God is overturned, if it is found to be untrue.

Luke 16: 29—31, *εχουσι Μωϋσεα και τους προφητας· ακουσατωσαν αυτων*, they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. Acts 24: 14. 2 Tim. 3: 14, 15.

ILLUSTRATION 18.

The divine origin of the Old Testament, the ground of its claim to absolute and universal credence.

2 Tim. 3 : 16, *πασα γραφη θεοπνευστος, και οφελιμος* the whole Scripture is inspired of God, and is profitable &c. Regarding *θεοπνευστος* as a predicate, we may render the passage thus: "the whole Scripture, i. e. the whole Old Testament, is given by inspiration of God." In this sense *γραφη* is used without the article, in 2 Pet. 1: 20. — Or we may render it: "all the Scriptures (the whole collection of the *ἱερων γραμματων*, mentioned in v. 15), i. e. *all the several parts* of the Old Testament, are given by inspiration of God." For, as the books of the O. T. are denominated, not only *ἡ γραφη* the Scripture, but sometimes also *αἱ γραφαι* the Scriptures, in the plural, (as e. g. in John 5: 39. Matth. 21: 42. 26: 54. Rom. 15: 4. 1 Cor. 15: 3, 4); so the singular, *ἡ γραφη*, may denote a particular part of the Old Testament, just as in John 19 : 27, it denotes a particular passage of the Old Testament. Both these modes of rendering, give this as the sense of the passage: *that the whole Old Testament is inspired of God.* But if, instead of regarding *θεοπνευστος* as a predicate, we view it as the *subject* and translate the passage thus: every divinely inspired writing is profitable for instruction &c.; still Paul, in stating this general principle, could have had no other object in view, than to confirm the fact, that the *ἱερα γραμματα* (the sacred writings mentioned in v. 15, which Timothy had known

from his youth,[1] i. e. the Holy Scriptures of the Jews, which, as Krebs and Lösner have proved from Josephus and Philo,[2] were known by the appellation *ιερα γραμματα*), were profitable for instruction &c.; or, as it is expressed in v. 15, that they are able to make us wise (*δυναμενα σοφισαι*[3]) in regard to the salvation[4] which is attained by confidence[5] in Jesus. Agreeably to the latter translation also, Paul presupposes that the *ιερα γραμματα* are *θεοπνευστα*, and that for this reason they are able *σοφισαι εις σωτηριαν*.[6] As to the word *θεοπνευστος*, we may explain it, either by recurring to the customary phrase *πνευμα θεου*, and thus make *γραφη θεοπνευστος* to signify writings which were composed by the Spirit of God, *εν πνευματι θεου*.[7] So in Philo,[8] the expression *θεοχρηστα λογια*, signifies *λογια εν χρησμῳ θεου edita*, divine oracular declarations. Or we may take the word *πνευστος*, in the expression *θεοπνευστος*, actively, according to the analogy of *απνευστος* (one who does not breathe); and then *θεοπνευστος* must be translated, "*spirans Deum* (*plenus Deo*)," and will denote writings which are *full of divinity*, from which the deity breathes forth. Kypke[9]

---

1 Acts 16: 1. comp. 2 Tim. 1: 5.

2 In their "Observations from Philo and Josephus," on this passage.

3 See Töllner On the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, p. 220 &c. and James Capellus, on 2 Tim. 3: 16.

4 *σωτηριαν δια πιστεως*, for *σωτηριαν την δια πιστεως*.

5 *Εις σωτηριαν—εις in reference to, quod attinet ad*; *εις* has this signification in Eph. 3: 16. Col. 4: 11. 2 Pet. 1: 8. See Dissert. de sensu vocis *πληρωμα*, Note 28. also Vigerus, de Idiotismis linguae Graecae, edit. Zeune, p. 575, where it is remarked that profane authors sometimes use it instead of *κατα*. Comp. Schleusner's Lex. in voc. *εις* no. 19.

6 Comp. Heinrich's N. Test. Vol. VII, epp. Pauli ad Tim. Titum, et Philem. complectens p. 173 &c.

7 See 2 Pet. 1: 21. Morus, Epitom. Theol. Christ. ed. 2. p. 31. Heinrich, l. c. p. 171.

8 De legatione, p. 1022, ed. Francf. 9 Kypke in Acta Apost. 9: 1.

remarks, "id spirare aliquis dicitur, quo plenus est et quasi turget, a person is said to breathe that, of which he is full, and by which he is as it were swelled up."

Agreeably to both the foregoing explanations, Paul attributes to God, a participation in the production of the Sacred Writings of the Jews. The nature of this participation is determined by the context. Paul had just been warning Timothy, that even if others did deviate from the truth, (*πλανωντες και πλανωμεμοι* v. 13), yet *he* ought to adhere (*μενειν*)[1] to that which he had been taught, and of the truth of which he had been convinced, *εμαθη και επιστωθη*[2] v. 14. In v. 14, 15, Paul adduces two reasons, on which Timothy's conviction of the truth of those christian doctrines which he had learned of Paul, was grounded. "Adhere strenuously to that which thou hast learned, and of the truth of which thou hast become convinced, because thou knowest from *whom* thou hast learned it, *ειδως παρα τινος εμαθες*; and because from thy childhood thou hast been acquainted with the Holy Scriptures (of the Old Testament), *ὁτι απο βρεφους ταίερα γραμματα οιδας*."[3] The *first*

---

[1] *μενειν* (*εν λογῳ*) to adhere to, to observe a doctrine; comp. John 8: 31, *μενειν εν λογῳ*, with v. 51, *τηρειν τον λογον*. See also Kypke on John 8: 31, and the passages which Krebs and Lösner adduce from Josephus, in their remarks on Gal. 3: 10, where *εμμενειν* has this signification. Particularly, the following passage from Josephus contr. Apionem, L. I. § 8, belongs here, "*πασι συμφυτον εστιν ευθυς εκ της πρωτης γενεσεως Ιουδαιοις, το νομιζειν αυτα* (*τα γραμματα ἡμων*) *θεου δογματα, και τουτοῖς εμμενειν*, the Jews all have an innate propensity, immediately from their infancy, to regard our Scriptures as the doctrines of God, and to adhere to them.

[2] *πιστουσθαι* to acquire a firm conviction of a matter. See Scultet's and Lösner's Note on this passage.

[3] The first reason is indicated by the participle *ειδως*; the second is expressed by *ὁτι*. A similar transition from one mode of construction to another, is found in other passages; e. g. John 2:

reason of Timothy's conviction of the truth of the doctrines taught him by Paul, is therefore founded on the *person of Paul*, his teacher (2 Tim. 1: 13); that is, in the divine authority of the apostle (§ 10), of which Timothy had every possible opportunity to be convinced, as he, having been the confidant of this apostle (2 Tim. 3: 10), must have had the very best advantages for knowing perfectly the character and miracles of Paul; and he must have been fully convinced, that nothing could be more inconsistent with the character of this apostle, than to suppose that he could, either designedly or from misapprehension, arrogate to himself the authority of a divine messenger, when it did not belong to him. The *second* ground of Timothy's conviction of the truth of Paul's doctrine, (that we can be saved only by reliance on the merits of Jesus,) was his intimate *acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures* of the Jews. These Scriptures, the apostle declares, were able *σοφισαι*, to afford to Timothy, (and through him as a teacher, to others also,) a salutary conviction of the truth of that christian doctrine. But these two different grounds of conviction, (the one derived from the divine authority of Paul, and the other from an acquaintance with the Old Testament,) by which Timothy was urged to adhere to the doctrines of christianity, could not have been thus combined together by Paul, if he had not believed the Old Test. to possess a divine authority, as well as himself. If we suppose that Paul had advanced, if not publicly, yet among his confidential friends, the opinion that the sacred writings of the Jews were by no means possessed of divine authority; or if we suppose that he had declared, contrary to the opinion of the Jews, that a part only of these writings were of divine authority; how

---

24, 25, *δια το—και ὁτι*. Acts 14: 22, *παρακαλουντες εμμενειν τη πιστει, και ὁτι*. Heb. 2 : 17, *ινα—γενηται—εις το ἱλασκεσθαι*. Compare aso Luke 3: 21. 1 Cor. 7: 26.

could he, when exhorting Timothy to adhere to his doctrines, urge the accordance of the Old Testament with them, as a prior (*απο βρεφους.*) argument in favour of their truth, or as affording evidence distinct from his own divine authority and independent of it? Timothy was the very individual whose intimacy with Paul, rendered him best acquainted with the private sentiments of that apostle; he must therefore have certainly known the fact, if Paul did not approve of that high veneration for the sacred books of the Jews, which he had imbibed in his youth; he must have known, that Paul regarded as authoritative, only those particular parts of these writings which he designated by virtue of his apostolical authority; and that to these parts such authority belonged, not because they were contained in the reputed sacred books of the Jews, but because an apostle had given to them his sanction. Timothy must have known, that Paul himself did not regard his second argument for adherence to his doctrines, as satisfactory, and as distinct from his own apostolical authority.

Now, whether God revealed unknown truths to the writers of the Old Testament, or whether he superintended and guided them while writing (§ 11), or whether he sanctioned their writings by a subsequent divine messenger (§ 12); it is certain from the declarations of the apostle Paul, that those books are in such a sense inspired and given by God, that they are to be regarded as of divine authority; and for this reason they are entitled to credence. And this is the precise idea of divine inspiration, which, in the days of Timothy, was instilled into the minds of all the Jews from their earliest infancy. For, agreeably to the testimony of Josephus above referred to,[1] the Jews were taught from their childhood, to regard their (twenty two) sa-

[1] Contra Apionem, Lib. I. § 8.

cred books as containing divine instructions. According to this same historian, they regarded no other books as worthy of equal respect. The reason which Josephus himself assigns, is, that the other books (the apocryphal), which were not found in the Jewish canon, have not the support of a certain and uninterrupted succession of prophets; or, that it cannot be proved, that there was an uninterrupted succession of prophets down to the times in which the apocryphal books were written. Because a book which lays claim to so high a degree of credibility, ought necessarily, to be written by a prophet,[1] that is, to be written under a divine influence, and thus become possessed of divine authority, or contain the *δογματα θεου*.

In reference to the various uses of the Old Testament, which Paul mentions (2 Tim. 3 : 16, 17), it should be recollected, that Paul does not here require of every private Christian, but only of every teacher who wishes faithfully to dicharge the duties of his profession (*τῳ του θεου ανθρωπῳ*), that he be fully acquainted with all the writings of the Old Testament, and be qualified to apply them to the confirmation of the apostles' doctrine, that dependance on the merits of Jesus is the condition of our salvation. And certainly, the more intimately a christian teacher was acquainted with the Old Testament, the better was he able, on the one hand, to convince the more en-

---

[1] Agreeably to Morus, the idea of a prophet includes: teaching by divine command, that which was revealed to him by God. The words of this excellent writer are, "Prophetae, quales Judaica natio habuit, et nos *κατ' εξοχην* prophetas aut legatos Dei ad illam gentem dicimus, prae se ferunt, et quae agunt docentque, ideo se agere et docere, quia jussi sint a Deo haec agere et docere, et id quod egerunt docueruntque ab eodem ipso acceperint. Ad haec duo, *jussi sunt*, *et rem* (doctrinam nominatim et vaticinia) *a Deo acceperunt*, redeunt omnes loci, ubi prophetae de missu divino loquuntur, suam legationem divinam describunt." Exod. 4: 12, 15, 16. Deut. 18 : 18. Jer. 1 : 6 sqq. Amos 3 : 7. Is. 61 : 1. Epitome Theol. Christianae, p. 20 et seq. S.

lightened Jews of the truth of christianity,[1] and on the other, to defend the christian doctrines against contumacious Jews.[2] Both *διδασκαλια* and *ελεγχος* (*instruction* and *refutation of opponents*) were, in the time of Timothy, principal duties of a christian teacher. But in general, familiarity with the Old Testament tends to produce a thorough comprehension and firm conviction of the truth of the doctrines of Jesus and his apostles. And even at the present day, our faith in Jesus, and our conviction of the divine mission of the apostles, may be confirmed and established by the writings of the Old Testament; and this, notwithstanding our belief in the divine authority of the Old Testament, is grounded principally on our conviction of the divine authority of Jesus and his apostles. For it must ever appear to the christian very remarkable, that the writings of the Old Covenant, which were composed long prior to the age of Christ and his apostles, and which were received as divine books by the Jews, the greater part of whom were enemies of christianity; should contain histories, instructions, and statutes which have a manifest and remarkably striking connexion with the more recent history and doctrines of Jesus, and had a specific reference to them long before they were in existence. The doctrine of the person and destination of Christ, is not the only one which admits of striking illustration from the Old Testament; on many other doctrines of christianity much light is thrown. Nay, the New Testament presupposes some doctrines to have been learned from the Old Testament, and therefore rather alludes to them than explains them.[3] Especially does the Old Testament present to us, a grand drama of divine providence, in the history of the Jewish nation, which is related

---

1 Acts 17: 11. 2 Acts 28: 28. Tit. 1: 10 &c.

3 Comp. Schott, Epitome Theologiae Christianae Dogmaticae, Leips. 1811, Praef. XIV. Comp. § 36—73.

from its commencement, and continued through a long series of years. Here, by express declarations of the prophets concerning the designs of God in particular events, and by the striking examples of a divine superintendence and government, the participation of God in the welfare and transactions of man, is displayed.[1] In this manner the Old Testament, by various instructions, (*διδασκαλιων* v. 16,) strengthens faith in Jesus and his doctrines. So also it tends to (*επανορθωσιν* v. 16) induce us to lay aside those sins which are inconsistent with faith in Jesus Christ, and to (*παιδειαν την εν δικαιοσυνη*) produce a practical reformation accordant with this faith. This it does, partly by its precepts and exhortations of various kinds, and partly by proposing examples and holding forth the divine approbation or displeasure.[2]

Some select observations on the practical value of the Old Testament, are contained in Reinhard's work, De vi, qua parvae res afficiunt animum, in doctrina de moribus diligentius explicanda, Viteberg, 1789.[3] Of the importance of the Old Test. in other respects, many excellent views are found in Winzenmann's History of Jesus as recorded by Matthew, No. 1. p. 3 &c. On the general contents and value of the Old Testament, See Hess, On the kingdom of God — History of the Israelites before the time of Jesus — On the importance and expediency

---

1 Vide Hess' Bibliothek der Heiligen Geschichte, Th. II. S. 17 ff.

2 1 Cor. 10: 5—11. Heb. 3: 15—4: 11.

3 Republished, with the author's additions and notes, by Eck, Berlin, 1793. On the Practical use of the Old Testament, the following works may likewise be compared: Beyer's Practical Introduction to the Old Testament, Pt. I. 1799. Pt. II. 1800. Pt. III. 1806 (by Augusti). The practical examples of the Old Testament, discussed exegetically, philosophically, and practically, by C. R. Pt. I. 1799. Pt. II. 1800. Stäudlin's history of the Practical divinity of Jesus, Pt. I. Göttingen, 1799, p. 72—356. His History of philosophical, Jewish, and Christian Ethics, Hanover, 1805; and Bauer's Biblical Ethics of the Old Testament, in 2 parts, Leipsic, 1803.

of the study of biblical history (in the Bibliotheca of sacred history, pt. I. p. 78 &c.), Köppen, The Bible a work of divine wisdom (Pt. I. Sect. 2. chap. 2, 3. p. 133 &c.), Jacobi's Dissertations on important points in religion (No. XVI. Pt. III. p. 109 &c.), Jahn's Introduction to the divine books of the Old Covenant (Pt. I. 2d ed. Vienna, 1802. p. 6—20), and Ewald, The religious doctrines of the Bible (Book 1. Sects. 1—4. p. 392 &c.).

Kant objects to the Mosaic religion, by maintaining that it is defective in the essential properties of a religion; 1. because all its precepts refer to external conduct, and have no reference to the moral feelings of the heart; 2. because it proposes only temporal rewards and punishments, and does not point its subject to a future state; and 3. because it excluded all other persons from the communion of the Jewish church. But his objections are answered in Eckermann's Beiträgen (B. 4. St. 2. S. 88—119),—in Stäudlin's History of the Ethical system of Jesus (Pt. I. p. 128—189), and in Flatt's Dissertation in vindication of the Mosaic religion, against the objections of Kant, (his Magazine, Vol. III. p. 76—132). In this dissertation, notice is taken of many things advanced by earlier as well as more recent authors, both such as were favourable and such as were opposed to the religion of Moses. The reader may also compare Tobler's Theologische Aufsätze und Andachts Blätter (Zurich, 1796. Num. 1), and Berger's Practical Introduction to the Old Testament (Pt. 1), and Ewald sup. cit. p. 201—212 &c.

§ 14.

Proof that the Jewish canon, in the days of Jesus, contained the same books which now constitute our Old Testament.

The inquiry, what were the particular books, known in the time of Jesus and his apostles, and denominated *ἱερα γραμματα* (1), or *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται*, or simply *ὁ νομος* (2), or *ἡ γραφη* (3), and which were sanctioned by our Saviour and his apostles, as writings of divine authority; must be determined principally (4) from the testimony of the New Testament. For, in addition to the books of Moses (5), which the New Testament expressly mentions and declares to be of divine authority (§ 13), as appears from the expression *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται*· the New Testament also specifies the following books, as belonging to the sacred canon of the Jews.

The book of *Joshua* and that of *Judges*, Heb. 11: 30—34 (compared with Josh. 6 : 2. Judg. 6: 4, 11, 14, 15). Acts 13 : 20, *μετα ταυτα — εδωκε κριτας* (6).

The books of *Samuel*, Matth. 12 : 3 &c. comp. 1 Sam. ch. 21. Heb. 1; 5. comp. 2 Sam. 7: 14 (7).

The books of *Kings*, Rom. 11 : 2. comp. 1 K. ch. 19 (8).

Daniel, Matth. 24: 15. comp. Dan. 9: 27. Heb. 11: 33, 34. comp. Dan. 6: 3.

Job, 1 Cor. 3: 19. comp. Job 5: 13 (9.)

Isaiah, Luke 4: 16 &c. comp. Is. 61: 1, 58 : 6. Acts 8: 30—35. comp. Is. ch. 53. John 6: 45. compare Is. 54 : 13. John 12 : 41. comp. Is. 6 : 10. 1 Cor. 14 : 21. comp. Is. 28 : 11. Rom. 3 : 15—19.

comp. Is. 59: 7, 8. Rom. 10: 11—21. comp. Is. 28: 16. 52: 7. 53: 1. 65 : 1, 2. 1 Pet. 2 : 6. comp. Is. 28: 16.

Jeremiah, Heb. 10 : 15. compare Jer. 31 : 33 &c.

Hosea, Rom. 9: 25. comp. Hos. 2: 25.

Joel, Acts 2: 16. comp. Joel 3: 1 &c.

Amos, Acts 7: 42. comp. Amos 5: 25. Acts 15: 15. comp. Amos 9: 11.

Jonah, Matth. 12: 39—41. comp. Jonah 2: 1.

Micah, John 7: 42. and Matth. 2 : 5. comp. Micah 5: 1.

Habakkuk, Acts 13: 40. comp. Hab. 1: 5.

Zechariah, Matth. 21 : 4. compare Zech. 9 : 9. John 19: 37. comp. Zech. 12: 10.

Malachi, Mark 1: 2. comp. Mal. 3: 1.

The book of Psalms, Luke 20 : 42, *Δαβιδ λεγει εν βιβλῳ ψαλμων.* Acts 1 : 20, *γεγραπται εν βιβλῳ ψαλμων.* Matth. 21: 42. (comp. Ps. 118: 22), *εν ταις γραφαις.* In Luke 24 : 44, they are called *ψαλμοι*, and in v. 45, are included among the *γραφας.* John 13 : 18. (comp. Ps. 41 : 10), *ινα πληρωθη ἡ γραφη.* Rom. 3: 10—14. comp. Ps. 14: 1. 5: 10. 140: 4. 10: 7. Rom. 3: 18, 19. comp. Ps. 36: 2. 107: 42.

Proverbs of Solomon, James 4 : 6. comp. Prov. 3: 34 (10).

To these books, which are expressly named in the New Testament, may be added *Ezekiel*, and *the four minor prophets*, which are not above mentioned; because it was customary, before the time of Jesus, to class (11) Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, together, under the appellation of The book of the Prophets (*βιβλος των προφητων*); as well as to count *twelve minor prophets* (12).

And that the other books, which are not named above, but which are, by Jews and Christians, re-

ceived into the canon of the Old Testament, were also admitted into the collection of Jewish sacred writings, at the time of Jesus and his apostles; is proved by the testimony of *Josephus*, their cotemporary. For, in his first book against Appion, (§ 8) (13), he states, that all the Jews (14) received twenty two books as sacred and of divine origin; and he also divides them, as Luke does (24: 44), into three principal classes. Now, if we attempt to make up the number of books given us by Josephus, we shall find that, according to the old Jewish method of calculating (15), besides those above mentioned, there are required exactly as many more as are now received by the Jews into their canon. And Josephus himself, in other passages, specifies the greater part of these additional books (16) as being such as were at that time received among the *Sacred Writings* (17).

Finally, it is evident from the substantial accordance of the passages of the Old Testament, quoted in the New Testament or in Josephus or Philo, with our present text, that the writings of the Old Testament, with which Jesus and his apostles were acquainted, and which they confirmed as divine, were in the same state in which they now are, and that they have not suffered any material alteration since that time. Moreover, the very same arguments, by which the integrity of the New Testament was established (§ 4), are also applicable to the Old Testament, and satisfactorily establish its integrity (18).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The signification of ἱερα γραμματα—ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται.

The writings of the Old Testament are termed *ἱερα γραμματα* sacred writings, in 2 Tim. 3 : 15; and *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται* the law and the prophets, in Acts 24: 14. Luke 16: 29, 31. Matth. 5: 17. comp. also Acts 28: 23. 13: 15. Rom. 3: 21. Matth. 7: 12. 22: 40. In a Dissertation on the most ancient division of the writings of the Old Covenant,[1] the author of this work has made the following remarks: "Josephus[2] uses the expression *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται*, and immediately after, quotes a passage from the Psalms (34 : 20), and another from the book of Proverbs (3: 18), both of which belong to the third class, the Hagiographa. This mode of expression may have been an ellipsis, for *ὁ νομος και οἱ προφηται, και τα λοιπα των βιβλων*; for the latter expression (*τα λοιπα* &c.) was commonly used to designate the third class of books or the Hagiographa. This form of expression, however, may have originated from the fact, that the writers of all the canonical books of the Old Testament except those of Moses, were termed *προφηται*, in the more extended sense of the word. It is evident that Peter used the word *προφηται* prophets, in this sense, in Acts 3 : 24, where he certainly did not exclude from among the *προφηταις, οἱ ελαλησαν και κατηγγειλαν τας ἡμερας ταυτας* (who foretold the time of Christ), the author of the Psalms, from whom he himself quotes a prophecy concerning Christ, Acts 2: 30.

Taken in a still greater latitude, the expression *οἱ προφηται* includes also Moses himself and the Mosaic writings; it em-

---

1 See Paulus' Neuem Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Literatur, Th. II. Num. 6. S. 239 &c.

2 De Maccabaeis, c. 18.

braces the whole Old Testament. Thus it is used in Acts 3: 18, 21, immediately after which, Moses is mentioned (v. 22), and in v. 24, *οἱ προφηται απο Σαμουηλ και των καθεξης* the prophets from Samuel and afterwards. Thus too, in Matth. 26: 56. Luke 18: 31. 24 : 25, by *προφηταις* we must understand the whole collection of sacred writings so far as they contained prophecies.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The word νομος or LAW.

This word is used, by synecdoche, for the whole Old Testament, in Matth. 5: 18. Luke 16: 17. John 10 : 34 (where the 6th verse of the 82d Psalm is quoted as a passage from the *νομος*). Rom. 3: 19, where the phrase *ὁσα ὁ νομος λεγει* as the law saith, refers to several passages quoted from the Psalms (v. 11—18).

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Γραφη or SCRIPTURE.

In John 10 : 35, *γραφη* denotes the collection of books which is termed *νομος*, in the 34th verse.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The canon of the Old Testament, determined principally by the New Testament.

All those books of the Old Testament, which are of any considerable use in the proof of the christian doctrines, and many others also, are specifically named in the New Testament, and classed among the holy Scriptures. Moreover, in the determination of the question, what books were contained in the Jewish canon, the testimony of the antilegomena of the New Testament, is as satisfactory evidence as that of the homologou-

mena, even to those who are not convinced of the genuineness of the former. For, let the authors have been who they may, they must have lived in the age of the apostles, or immediately after; and consequently were as well qualified to bear testimony relative to the particular books, which were then received into the Jewish canon, as the authors of the homologoumena, or Philo, or Josephus.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The books of Moses, of which Josephus[1] also mentions five, are all of them quoted in the New Testament.

Genesis, or the first book of Moses, is quoted, Rom. 4 : 3, 17 &c. see Gen. 15 : 6, 5, and 17 : 5. Gal. 3 : 8. see Gen. 12: 3. Gal. 4: 21 &c. see Gen. 21: 2, 9. comp. with 16: 15.

Exodus, or the second — Ex. 3: 6 is quoted in Mark 12: 26. and Ex. 33: 19. 9: 16, in Rom. 9: 15, 17.

Leviticus, or the third — Lev. 12 : 8 is quoted in Luke 2: 24. and Lev. 18: 5, in Rom. 10: 5.

Numbers, or the fourth —Num. 21: 8, 9 is quoted in John 3: 14. and Num. 25 : 1, 9. 21: 4 &c. 14 : 2, 36, in 1 Cor. 10: 8—11.

Deuteronomy, or the fifth book of Moses — Deut. 24 : 1 is quoted in Matth. 19: 7. and Deut. 25 : 5, in Matth. 22 : 24. and Deut. 18 : 5, in Acts 3 : 22. and Deut. 32 : 21, in Rom. 10: 19.

Eichhorn, in his Introduction to the Old Testament,[2] remarks, that Philo quotes all the five books, and in terms of the highest respect.[3]

---

[1] Contra Apionem, Lib. I. § 8. [2] Part I. p. 89. 2d ed.

[3] On the genuineness of the Pentateuch, on the various conjectures and objections which have been made in reference to the time and the manner of its composition, the reader may consult Eichhorn's Introd. to the O. T. Pt. II. § 405—415. Jahn's Introd. to O. T. Pt. II. Sect. I, Vienna,

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Joshua and Judges.

In the first passage mentioned in the text, and to which this Illustration refers, some narratives are adduced from the books of Joshua and Judges, in connexion with other narratives from the Old Testament. It is only after the second clause of the 35th verse, that examples are adduced, which are not contained in the canonical books.[1] The reader may compare with this text, ch. 46 : 1—15 of the book of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus. Josephus expressly classes the book of Joshua among the sacred writings ;[2] and he makes much use of the book of Judges, in the 5th book of his Jewish Antiquities.[3]

ILLUSTRATION 7.

The books of Samuel.

In Matth. 12: 3, 4, the passage quoted from the first book of Samuel, is placed in connexion with another, quoted (v. 5) from Num. 28: 9, 10. In Heb. 1: 5, a passage from Psalm 2: 7, is placed in immediate connexion with one from 2 Sam. 7 : 14. The book of Sirach (46: 16—47) contains narratives from both the books of Samuel. Philo quotes the first book of Samuel by its customary name among the Greek Jews, viz. first book of

---

1803. p. 15—95. also Griesinger on the Pentateuch, Stuttgard, 1806, p. 31—43. Tübing. gel. Anzeig. for 1806, No. 85. p. 675—688. Critique on Vater's hypothesis relative to the Pentateuch, proposed in his Commentary. The same work for 1808. No. 38. p. 304, 306 &c. De Wette's Critical Essay on the credibility of the books of Chronicles in reference to the Mosaic history and legislation. Weber's History of the art of writing, Göttingen, 1807, No. I, II. On the literature of this investigation, see Augusti's Sketch of a historico-critical Introd. to the Old Testament, Jena, 1806. p. 128 &c.

[1] Storr, on Heb. 11: 35, note k. [2] Antiq. Lib. V. ch. 1. § 17.

[3] See Eichhorn's Introd. Pt. 1. p. 115 &c.

kings, and uses the phrase *ὡς ὁ ἱερος λογος φησι*;[1] and Josephus frequently quotes both the books of Samuel, in his Jewish Antiquities, books V—VII.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The books of Kings.

The second book of Kings is quoted, in connexion with the first (which Paul in the passage cited reckons among the *γραφη*), in Luke 4: 25—27; the second book (5: 14) is quoted in the 27th verse; and the first (ch. 17: 1, 9. 18: 44), in verses 25 and 26. Josephus[2] designates the books of the kings and the book of Genesis, by the name of *ἱεροι βιβλοι* sacred books.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

The books of Job and Daniel.

The books of Psalms and Job are, in 1 Cor. 3: 19, 20, quoted in the same manner, and placed in connexion with each other. In Matth. ch. 24, reference is had to the second or prophetic part of Daniel; and the first or historical part is quoted in Heb. 11: 34, where Paul draws all his examples from books which belonged to the sacred canon of the Jews: the words *εφραξαν στοματα λεοντων, εσβεσαν δυναμιν πυρος* they stopped the mouths of lions, and quenched the flames of fire, allude to Dan. 6: 22. 3: 15 &c.: afterward, in the beginning of the 35th verse, the words *ελαβον—αὐτων* contain an incident quoted from 2 Kings (4: 21), a canonical book of the Old Testament. Josephus also found both the historical and the prophetic parts of Daniel in his copy of the sacred books of the Jews, among which he expressly classed the book of Daniel.[3] In ch. 10. §

---

1 De Temulentia, opp. T. I. p. 379, ed. Mangey.

2 Antiq. Lib. IX. cap. 2. § 2.

3 Ant. Jud. Lib. X. cap. 10, 11.

4, he says expressly, *το βιβλιον Δανιηλου, εὑρησει και τουτο εν τοις ἱεροις γραμμασιν* the book of Daniel he will also find among the sacred writings. And it was the historical part of Daniel which led the ancient Jews to class the book with the historical or first part of (*των προφητων*) the prophetic writings.

In his dissertation On the most ancient division of the books of the Old Covenant, the author of this work has remarked: "We frequently find the book of Daniel classed with the writings of the prophets, strictly so called;[1] but in the most ancient times, the character of a book was determined by its first chapters, and accordingly this was placed in the second class or the prophets. This explains the reason which induced Sirach (48 : 22—49, 10) to omit Daniel in his enumeration of the prophets."[2]

ILLUSTRATION 10.

Proverbs of Solomon.

Josephus, citing passages from the sacred writings (*εκ του νομου και των προφητων*), quotes among others, a passage from the Proverbs of Solomon (ch. 3: 18).[3]

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Οἱ Προφηται—the Prophets.

In his dissertation, already cited, On the most ancient divis-

---

[1] See Jahn's Introduction, Pt. II. Sect. I. p. 631.

[2] See also Stäudlin's New Contributions for the Elucidation of the prophets of the Bible, No. III, IV. In reference to Illustrations 5—9, the reader may consult Cammerer's Theological and critical Essays, No. 1. § 5—12, where the passages cited in the New Testament from the Old, and those in Josephus and Philo, are adduced, and accompanied with remarks. Knapp, in his Greek Test. and Schott, in his Latin version, also give us all the quotations of the New Testament from the Old.

[3] In his book concerning the Maccabees, ch. 18. See also Illust. 1. and the New Repertory, p. 239. Note 28.

ion of the books of the Old Covenant,[1] the author of this work remarks: "To the second class of the canonical books of the Old Testament, which are termed *οἱ προφηται*, in the more strict sense of the term (Illust. 1), belonged the historical books of the Old Testament, which, together with the book of Joshua, were immediately attached to the Pentateuch; and also the strictly prophetic books, *οἱ προφηται* the prophets, in the most limited sense. The latter seem to be referred to in Acts 13: 40, *το ειρημενον εν τοις προφηταις* that which was declared by the prophets, and in Acts 7 : 42, *βιβλος των προφητων* book of the prophets; compare also John 6 : 45. And this collection of strictly prophetic books, again, was subdivided into two parts, the one embracing Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, (which are enumerated in the book of Sirach, ch. 48: 22. 49 : 6, 8,) and the other including the twelve minor prophets, *οἱ δωδεκα προφηται*."

ILLUSTRATION 12.

The Twelve Prophets.

The appellation *οἱ δωδεκα προφηται* the twelve prophets, was used before the time of Christ and the apostles, by Sirach, ch. 49: 10, and in the days of the apostles, by Josephus, Antiq. Lib. X. cap. 2. § 2, and afterwards, by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. IV. 26.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

Division of the sacred books into three classes.

The entire passage of Josephus, is as follows:[2] *μητε του ὑπογραφειν αυτεξουσιου πασιν οντος, μητε τινος εν τοις γραφομενοις ενουσης διαφωνιας· αλλα μονων των προφητων τα μεν ανωτατω και παλαιοτατα. κατα την επιπνοιην την απο του θεου*

[1] Sup. cit. p. 232.

[2] Contra Apionem, Lib. I. § 7, 8.

μαθοντων, τα δε καθ' ἑαυτους, ὡς εγενετο σαφως συγγραφον των, ου μυριαδες βιβλιων εισι παρ' ἡμων, ασυμφωνων και μαχομενων· δυο δε μονα προς τοις εικοσι βιβλια, του παντος εχοντα χρονου την διαγραφην, τα δικαιως πεπιστευμενα (θεια ed. Havercamp.). Και τουτων πεντε μεν εστι τα Μωϋσεως, ἁ τους (τε νομους ed. Oberthür) γενομενους περιεχει, και την απ' ανθρωπογονιας παραδοσιν, μεχρι της αυτου τελευτης—απο δε της Μωϋσεως τελευτης μεχρι της Αρταξερξου του μετα Ξερξην Περσων βασιλεως αρχης, οἱ μετα Μωϋσην προφηται τα κατ' αυτους πραχθεντα συνεγραφαν εν τρισι και δεκα βιβλιοις. Αἱ δε λοιπαι τεσσαρες ὑμνους εις τον θεον, και τοις ανθρωποις ὑποθηκας του βιου περιεχουσιν: "Inasmuch as not every one who pleased, was permitted to write, and as our writings contain no contradictions; the prophets having been taught by divine inspiration the earliest and most ancient events, and having recorded with fidelity the history of their own times; therefore our books are neither numerous nor contradictory. The number of our books is only twenty two, containing a universal history, and these, with the utmost propriety, claim our belief. To these twenty two books, belong the five books of Moses, which describe the origin of the human family, and their whole history until the death of Moses.—The prophets after Moses, have, in thirteen books, recorded the history of their own times, from the death of Moses until the reign of Artaxerxes, the Persian monarch who succeeded Xerxes. The remaining four books contain hymns of praise to God, and practical precepts for the government of mankind." A similar division of the sacred books into three classes, is found in the preface to the book of Sirach: 1, νομος, 2, οἱ προφηται, and 3, οἱ αλλοι οἱ κατ' αυτους ηκολουθηκοτες, i. e. the other books which, (like the prophets,) follow after the νομος.[1] The author of this preface (v. 2) also

[1] Vide Dissert. sup. cit. p. 230 &c.

calls the third class, *αλλα πατρια βιβλια* other books transmitted to us from our fathers; and v. 6, *τα λοιπα των βιβλιων* the rest of the books. Philo,[1] likewise, divides the sacred writings (*τα ἱερωτατα γραμματα*) into 1, *νομους*— the Mosaic writings; 2, *λογια θεσπισθεντα δια προφητων*—oracular declarations of the prophets;—(both expressions are synecdochical); and 3, *ὑμνους και τα αλλα, οἱς επιστημη, και ευσεβεια συναυξονται και τελειουνται* hymns of praise and other books by which wisdom and piety are promoted. It is doubtless this same classification, which is expressed in Luke 24: 44, by the *παντα τα γεγραμμενα* 1) *εν τῳ νομῳ Μωϋσεως και* 2) *προφηταις και* 3) *ψαλμοις*— all things which were written (1) in the law of Moses and (2) in the prophets and (3) in the Psalms. The Psalms, being the first book of the third class, is put by synecdoche for the whole class.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 14.

The Alexandrian canon contained the same twenty two books as that of Palestine.

I. Had it been a matter of public notoriety, that the Alexandrian Jews had more, and the Sadducees fewer than twenty two books which they regarded as divine, how could Josephus[3] have remarked, that "no one has ever ventured either to alter, or to add to, or to detract from these (twenty two) national books. For the belief of the divinity of these books is instilled into all the Jews, from their very infancy.

II. Eichhorn adduces the following arguments, to prove that the canon of the Egyptian Jews contained no apocryphal books, and did not differ from that of Palestine.[4]

---

1 De vita contemplativa, p. 893, ed. Francof.

2 See Dissert. sup. cit. p. 225 &c. 229 &c. 246 &c.

3 Against Ap. B. I. § 8. 4 Einleitung, Th. I. § 21—26.

1. The Egyptian Jews always had more or less connexion with those of Palestine; and both were solicitous to maintain entire accordance with each other.

2. Jesus the son of Sirach, designates their ancient sacred books substantially in the same manner, as Josephus and the New Testament do: viz. "the Law, the Prophets, and the other books." See Illust. 12.

3. Jesus the son of Sirach, distinguishes very particularly the moral sayings of his grandfather, an Apocryphal book, from "the Law, the Prophets, and the other writings," i. e. from the sacred books of the Jews: see his introduction or preface.

4. Philo was acquainted with the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, for he borrows phrases and expressions from them; but not in a single instance has he quoted any of them; much less does he allegorize upon them, or make use of them to prove any point which he would establish.

Let the reader examine the Review (in Eichhorn's Bibliotheca of Biblical Literature, Vol. IV) of "An attempt to elucidate the history of the Jewish and Christian sacred canons," (Halle, 1792,) in which it is asserted, that the Hellenistic and Palestine canons were different, (p. 155—184). and Bauer's Introduction to the Old Testament, Nuremberg, 1794, p. 56—60.

Jahn,[1] in opposition to these arguments in favour of the identity of the Egyptian and Palestine canon, urges 1, that the Egyptian Jews professed to be independent of those of Palestine, and that they maintained but little ecclesiastical intercourse; 2, that the son of Sirach, and Philo, may have included the Apocrypha in the third class of books, without making a fourth; 3, that several books of the Old Testament are not quoted by

[1] Einleitung, 2te auflage, Th. I. S. 25. S. 132 &c.

Philo, at least not with the accompanying declaration of their divinity. From these arguments, however, we can only infer, that it is possible the Apocrypha was included in the canon of the Egyptian Jews. The whole investigation seems to lean to the conclusion, that the apocryphal books might have been regarded as deutero-canonical, books of secondary authority. The arguments adduced by Augusti, in his Introduction (p. 73), to prove that the Egyptian canon included the Apocrypha, are chiefly derived from Corrodi's Elucidation of the Bible canon.

III. The opinion, that the Sadducees rejected all the books of the Old Testament canon excepting the five books of Moses, (which was advanced by some of the ancient fathers, and is considered as probable by some late critics, from the fact that Jesus proved (Matth. 22: 31 &c.) to the Sadducees the resurrection, by a quotation from Exodus,[1]) is contradicted by Eichhorn (Introd. to O. T. p. 96 &c.) on the following grounds:

1. The sect of the Sadducees took their rise at a time when the Jewish canon had been closed; and it was just as easy for them to make their opinions harmonize with the other books of the Old Testament, as with the books of Moses.

2. Josephus (Antiq. B. XIII. c. 10. § 6) merely states, in reference to the Sadducees, that they adhered exclusively to the *written* precepts (*τα γεγραμμενα*), and rejected the traditions; he no where states, that they were distinguished from the Phari-

---

1 This opinion is modified in the following manner, by Corrodi (sup. cit. p. 110. comp. Paulus' Comment. in Nov. Test. Pt. I. p. 196. Pt. III. p. 298. supplement, p. 149, 151 &c.): The Sadducees probably only attached a high degree of value to the Pentateuch; they appear to have respected the other books only so far as they accorded with the Pentateuch and were founded on it. — "But the dissent of the Sadducees from the common opinion, is very uncertain, and is no evidence against the historical credibility of the twenty two canonical books."

sees by the rejection of all the books of the canon except the Pentateuch.

3. How could Sadducees have sustained the office of high-priest, if they had departed, in so important a point, from the belief of the nation?[1]

ILLUSTRATION 15.

The Jewish numeration of the sacred books.

It was customary among the Jews, to count the books of Judges and Ruth, the two books of Samuel, the two books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, Jeremiah and the Lamentations, and finally, the twelve minor prophets, severally, as being single books.

ILLUSTRATION 16.

The books not specifically mentioned by Josephus,[2] are Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon. But these must necessarily be reckoned to the canon of the Old Testament, in order to make up the four books (*λοιποι τεσσαρες*), which he expressly mentions as belonging to the third general class. For, that Josephus reckoned all the historical books into the second class (that of the thirteen prophets), may be assumed as certain. The transfer of several of the historical books into the third class, was probably of a later date. For, Philo describes the books of the third class, in the same manner as Josephus does, namely, as books containing (chiefly) hymns of praise to God, and moral lessons. And as it is certain that several historical books, such as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, were classed among those which were strictly prophetical (the second class); what could be more natural, than to place also the

---

[1] Compare Güldenappel's Dissert. Josephi Archaeologi de Sadducaeorum canone sententiam exhibens, Jena, 1804.

[2] Contra Apion. I. 8. See also Illust. 13.

other historical books, Ruth, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Chronicles, in the same class, and thus make the third class to consist only of such as were neither historical nor prophetical ?[1]

Michaelis[2] puts Job in the place of the Song of Solomon, and places Ruth instead of Job in the second class of thirteen books, regarding Ruth not as connected with Judges, but as a distinct book. Camerer,[3] by a different process, excludes the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes from the canon. He wishes to count Ezra and Nehemiah, Jeremiah and the Lamentations, as four distinct books; and to place in the third class the Lamentations and Job, instead of Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon. But neither the separation of Ruth from Judges, nor of Ezra from Nehemiah, nor of Jeremiah from the Lamentations, will correspond with the mode of calculation adopted by the Jews (Illust. 15), as is evident from the testimony of Origen. Equally improbable is the assumption, that Job was placed in the third class, and not in the second, of which the historical books formed a part; for the book of Job was uniformly, by all antiquity, received as a true history. It is true, Josephus does not himself quote the book of Job; and the reason probably was, that in writing a history of the Jews, he had

---

1 Repertor. sup. cit. p. 227 &c. 2 Dogmatik, S. 112 f.

3 Theolog. und kritische Versuche, N. I. § 14—19. In addition to this proposition, the assumption, that in the time of Josephus the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes did not belong to the canon, is supported (in the work sup. cit. § 18) by the conjecture that it seems that some books were lost from the canon, after the days of Josephus. From Josephus (Antiquit. X. c. 11. § 7), where the writer is speaking of *βιβλιοις Δανιηλου*, it is inferred that other writings of Daniel beside the Book of Daniel, were then in existence. In refutation of this, it is remarked (in the Tüb. gel. Anzeig. for 1794, No. 74. p. 590), that Josephus evidently is speaking of the writings of Daniel which have descended to us, which he divides into several parts (*βιβλια*), inasmuch as every thing which he there quotes from these *βιβλιοις Δανιηλου*, is contained in our book of Daniel. See Bertholdt's Daniel, Erlangen, 1806, the Introduction, p. 86 &c.

no occasion for quoting it. But there cannot be the least possible doubt, that he found it among the sacred books of his nation, among which it is also classed in the New Testament (Illust. 9); and that, for the reason stated, he placed it in the second class.[1] Perhaps, the book of Job was subjoined to the historical part of the second class, as an appendix; for it was regarded as a history, though not of the Israelites.[2]

Agreeably to what has been said, the canon of Josephus is as follows: *First* class, the five books of Moses. *Second* class, 1, Joshua; 2, Judges and Ruth; 3, the two books of Samuel; 4, the two books of Kings; 5, the two books of Chronicles; 6, Daniel; 7, Ezra and Nehemiah; 8, Esther; 9, Job; 10, Isaiah; 11, Jeremiah and the Lamentations; 12, Ezekiel; 13, the twelve minor prophets. *Third* class, 1, the Psalms; 2, Proverbs; 3, Ecclesiastes; 4, the Song of Solomon.

ILLUSTRATION 17.

Books of the Old Testament referred to by Josephus.

Among the books not specifically named in the New Testament, but still used as authorities by Josephus, are Ruth, both books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

Eichhorn, in his introduction to the Old Testament,[3] quotes the passages in which Josephus cites or alludes to the books just mentioned. In general, every book which can be proved to have been known to Josephus, and which was not written after the time of Artaxerxes, belonged to the canon of Josephus. For agreeably to the passage above quoted,[4] all the books prior to the time of Artaxerxes, were written by prophets, and

---

1 Eichhorn, Pt. I. p. 118 &c. 2 Repertor. sup. cit. 232.
3 Pt. I. § 47. 3 Illust. 13.—Jos. contr. Ap. Lib. I. § 8.

were therefore divine writings. He closed the canon of the Old Testament with the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus; for he regarded the book of Esther, which he supposed was written at that time, as the last of all the Old Testament writings (Antiq. B. XI. c. 6. § 1.)[1]

ILLUSTRATION 18

On the genuineness and integrity of the Old Testament, the reader may [in addition to § 4 of this work] consult Griesinger on the Authenticity of the Old Testament, Stuttgard, 1804. and Jahn's Introduction to the divine books of the Old Covenant, Pt. I. § 6—14, p. 31—66.

[1] Eichhorn, sup. cit. p. 104 &c.

§ 15.

The Scriptures must be received as a perfect rule (norma) of faith and practice.

From the evidence which has been adduced (§ 11—13) in support of the divine authority and credibility of the writings of the Old (§ 14) and New (§ 1—11) Testaments (1), as respects their doctrines, prophecies, and history; it necessarily and spontaneously follows, that we are bound to receive as divine (2) all the instructions and precepts, which are either given by the writers themselves, or communicated by them as the instructions and precepts of God (3); and to receive all their statements, as indubitably and perfectly true (4). In short, the decisions which are contained in Scripture, as soon as they are satisfactorily ascertained (5), must be received by us as the standard (norma) for the regulation of our judgments (6).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

That nothing may be advanced, to which the most anxious and scrutinizing examination of christianity can attach the least shadow of doubt; I shall seldom rely, exclusively, on proofs derived from the antilegomena of the New Testament; or on the authority of those books of the Old Testament, which are not explicitly quoted in the New, as divine (§ 14. Illust. 4, 15, 16); or on books, the authority of which depends not merely on their historical credibility, but also on the divine authority of Mark and Luke.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The obligation of the divine precepts.

Precepts which are given under certain limitations, are valid only so far as they extend. And if it be said, that some precepts are not obligatory on men, or on men in all circumstances; this will by no means exclude them from the catalogue of divine precepts. The reason why they are not obligatory on certain persons, is, that God did not see fit to extend their obligation to them, and not that their author is any other being than the common Lord of the universe. In Köppen's work entitled, "The Bible a work of divine wisdom,"[1] it is remarked, that all the special precepts of God are merely particular applications of universal divine commands; and that these cannot be universal, because they are limited to the accidental circumstances of time, place, and persons. The reader may compare Nitzsch's Programm on the local and temporary precepts of the christian ethical code, entitled, De judicandis morum praeceptis in Novo Testamento a communi omnium hominum ac temporum usu alienis.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Obligation of the passages in which God or a divine messenger is introduced as speaking.

To this class belong those passages in which God himself is introduced as speaking, as is often the case in the writings of the ancient prophets; and also those which contain the declarations of a divine messenger, such as an angel, or a man the divinity of whose mission is asserted by the inspired writer himself, or by some other having divine authority. Thus, the di-

---

[1] Pt. I. p. 457 &c. 2d edit.

[2] Wittemberg, 1791—1800. See also Tüb. gel. Anz. Jahrg. 1801, St. 21.

vine mission of John the Baptist (John 1: 31), is confirmed not only by Luke, but also by John an apostle, and by Christ himself. See Luke 3: 2. 7: 29, 30. John 1: 6. Matth. 11: 9—14. Matth. 21: 25—35. John 5: 32—35.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Absolute historical credibility of the Scriptures.

In the narrations of Scripture, a distinction must be made, between historical truth and *universal truth*. These narratives are all historically true, but not all true in every respect; they possess the latter character, only when the sanction of the Scripture is added to them. Thus, when the inspired writers state, that particular persons uttered certain expressions or entertained certain opinions; these expressions and opinions are not therefore to be regarded as infallibly true, unless the Scriptures express approbation of them.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The legitimate interpretation of Scripture.

Whenever the reading of a particular passage is unquestionable, and a legitimate exegesis proves a certain sentiment to be contained in it; then, and then only, is it satisfactorily shown that the passage contains that sentiment. Hence, in order to confer the greatest possible degree of certainty on this course of christian doctrines, passages of which there are various readings, are never adduced in this work, except when the canons of criticism show the reading adduced, to have preponderating evidence in its favour; and even then they are accompanied with other passages.[2]

---

[1] See the Dissert. de sensu historico, § 10.

[2] On the historical interpretation of the New Testament, see Dissert. de sensu historico, 1778. Keil, de historica librorum sacrorum interpreta-

The Moral Interpretation, which Kant has advocated,[1] consists in setting aside the laws of grammatical and historical interpretation, and attributing a moral meaning to those passages of Scripture, which, agreeably to grammatical interpretation, contain nothing coincident with the moral dictates of unassisted reason. Nothing more is necessary, according to this hypothesis, than that it be *possible* to attach a moral meaning to the passage, no matter how forced or unnatural it be. In the "Historical and critical view of the influence of Kant's philosophy on the different branches of science and practical divinity,"[2] is a statement of the different works and dissertations on Kant's mode of interpretation, with some account of the arguments for and against it; see also Schmidt's work "On the christian religion &c."[3] The following are the principal arguments which have been urged against this mode of interpretation, by Nösselt, Rosenmüller, the author of this work,[4] and others:

1. Such a mode of explaining Scripture, does not deserve the name of an interpretation; for this moral interpreter does not inquire what the Scriptures actually *do* teach, by their own declarations, but what they *ought* to teach agreeably to his opinions.

2. The principle is incorrect, which is assumed as the basis of this mode of interpretation, namely, "that the grammati-

---

tione ejusque necessitate, Leips. 1788. and his Hermeneutics of the New Testament, Leips. 1810. pref. p. VIII &c. § 5. and his Vindication of the grammatico-historical interpretation of the New Testament, in the Analecta for the study of exegetical and systematic theology, edited by Keil and Tzschirner, No. I, Leips. 1812. No. IV. p. 47 &c.

1 Religion innerhalb den Grenzen der blossen Vernunft, S. 150—153. and Streit der Facultäten, S. 49—56.

2 1796–97, first part, p. 101 &c. 2d part, p. 12 &c.

3 Jena, 1797, p. 420—476.

4 Observations on Kant's philosophical religious doctrines, § 17.

cal sense of a passage of Scripture cannot be admitted, or at least is of no use in ethics, whenever it contains a sentiment which reason alone could not discover and substantiate."

3. Such a mode of interpretation is altogether unnecessary; for the Bible is abundantly sufficient for our instruction in religion and morality, if its precepts are construed as applying directly or by consequence to the moral necessities of every man. And, although there are passages of difficult explanation in the Bible, as might naturally be expected from the antiquity and peculiar languages of the Scriptures; yet, in most instances these passages do not relate to doctrines; and when they do, the doctrines in question are generally taught in other and plainer passages.

4. As, on this plan, the mere possibility of attaching a moral import to a text, is regarded as a sufficient sanction for regarding it as the true signification; almost every passage must be susceptible of a multitude of interpretations, as was the case during the reign of the mystical and allegorical mode of interpretation which has long since been exploded. This must produce confusion in religious instruction, want of confidence in the Bible, and indeed a suspicion as to its divine authority; for this must be the natural effect of the moral mode of interpretation on the majority of minds.

5. If such a mode of interpreting the doctrines of christianity should prevail, it is not seen, how insincerity and deceit, on the part of interpreters, are to be detected and exposed.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

No necessity that every doctrine of the Scriptures, should be taught by reason also.

After the existence and the attributes of God have once been proved (§ 17—26) [they are presupposed, whenever we receive any testimony as divine, and as therefore worthy of our

entire confidence], the examination of the doctrines of christianity, is a *historical investigation*. The credibility of what the Scriptures teach, depends on their authority. And although it may be a desirable thing to have other arguments, derived from reason and experience, in support of the doctrines of the Bible; still, it is by no means necessary that every doctrine should be confirmed by the dictates of reason, or by arguments derived from the nature of things. For, should we receive any doctrine merely upon the authority of Scripture, without any other proof, we should still be acting rationally; we should be doing precisely what all men do when they believe any thing on the testimony of credible witnesses, without having any other evidence of its truth. Nor do we by this course discard the use of our reason; for our reason is exercised in the investigation of the genuineness, the import, and the authority, of the testimony of the sacred writers. Reason is also employed in the comparison and combination of the doctrines learned from the Scriptures, with one another and with other doctrines.[1]

The reasonableness of believing doctrines which cannot be proved from the principles of reason, and the truth of which rests solely on the authority of a historical basis; is discussed in Annotationes ad philosophicam Kantii de religione doctrinam, § III, VII, XV. The objections against the moral and metaphysical possibility of *positive* doctrines, (i. e. of doctrines taught by a divine revelation, but which reason alone could not have discovered,) contained in Fichte's "Critique on all Revelations," in his work "On Religion as a Science," 1795. and in other works;[2]

---

1 See Köppen, Pt. II. p. 553 &c. 608 &c. (2d ed. p. 584, 628 &c.) and Jacobi's Dissertations on important points of religion, No. VIII. Pt. II. p. 5 &c. and Doederlein's Institutio Theologi Christiani, prolegom. cap. III. sect. III. § 53, 56. On the relation of reason to the Bible, see also Reinhard's Lectures on doctrinal theology, § 28. and Augusti, On christian doctrines, Leipsic, 1809, p. 1040 &c.

2 [Some of the doctrines of the Bible are taught also by reason; there

are answered in the following works: "Remarks on the evidence of the possibility and reality of a revelation, derivable from the moral dictates of reason," by Süskind, in the supplement to his German translation of "Annot. ad Kantii philosophicam de religione doctrinam."[1]—"How can the absolute divinity of a professed revelation be ascertained?"[2]—"On the province of reason in the negative determination of the import of a revelation," by Süskind.[3]—A review of the work entitled, "Neue Erklärung des höchstwichtigen Paulinischen Gegensatzes, Buckstabe und Geist.[4]—and Stäudlin's Dogmatik und Dogmengeschichte.[5]

---

are others for which we are indebted wholly and exclusively to revelation. The former were, in the phraseology of systematic divinity, termed *articuli mixti*, the latter *articuli puri*. They were thus defined: *purus* est dogma revelatum, cujus ratio ex sola revelatione reddi potest; *mixtus* est dogma revelatum, cujus ratio tam ex revelatione, quam ex ratione dari potest. The object aimed at by the above writers, is, therefore, to erase from the pages of our Bible, every thing which is purely matter of revelation!! S.]

[1] p. 166—222. [2] Flatt's Mag. Vol. I. No. 2. p. 74—78.

[3] Flatt's Mag. Vol. II. p. 95—109. [4] Tüb. gel. Anz. 1799. No. 94.

[5] § 42. 3d edit. Götting. 1809. § 22. p. 104 &c. Tzschirner's Memorabilien, B. I. St. 2. S. 123 &c.

§ 16.

Evidence of the divinity of the Scriptures, derived from personal experience.

Persons not religiously disposed, may, prior to any examination into the truth of the christian doctrines, be prejudiced against them, by the fear of condemnation from them, John 7: 7. 3: 19 &c. But whoever strives to live to the glory of God, and so as to meet the divine approbation (1), will be kept from such a premature condemnation of christianity (2), by the consideration, that its precepts offer him a prospect of becoming better acquainted with the will of God. He will be willing to examine christianity closely, because he expects, that if it be of divine origin, it will approve his zeal in the cause of virtue, and stimulate him to greater exertion, John 3 : 21. Nor is the hope a delusive one. For, the more he studies and follows in his practice the doctrines of christianity, the more will he find by his own experience, that he is advancing in the knowledge of that truth which makes him happy, which gives peace to his mind, and meliorates his heart. And thus will his own experience satisfy him of the divinity of the doctrines of christianity, John 7: 17; or of the truth of the account which its first teachers give of its origin. I should, indeed, hesitate to infer, merely from the salutary influence of the doctrines of christianity on the mind, that they were promulgated by the extraordinary and direct agency of God (3); for I fear I should be unable to render this proof sufficiently evident to others (4). Nevertheless, it is undeniable, that

the credibility of the declarations of Jesus and his apostles, (which is the general ground for belief in the divine authority of the doctrines of christianity, and of the holy Scriptures generally,) is greatly corroborated and rendered in a high degree probable (5), by the following considerations: first; all who make a conscientious use of the christian doctrines, experience precisely those effects from them, which a divine revelation must produce; or, in other words, the Bible accomplishes precisely what we have a right to expect from a divine revelation (6). Secondly; a conscientious use of the doctrines of christianity, must excite a feeling of high reverence for the expanded views and the great piety of the persons (7) who first published these doctrines. And those who, by such an intimate acquaintance with christianity, have become the subjects of this feeling of high reverence (8), will be impressed with the thought, that such doctrines could not have originated from these men, who were nearly all totally void of education, John 7: 15. Acts 4: 13. And this consideration will add to the credibility of their statement, that they had the assistance of God in publishing these doctrines. Or at least, it will appear unwarrantable to charge men so far surpassing the best and most learned teachers of their age, with such a degree of enthusiasm or villany (9), as must be ascribed to them, if their pretensions to a divine influence were either a delusion or an imposture.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The religious man, a more impartial judge of revelation, than the irreligious.

John 3: 21, *ὁ ποιων την αληθειαν—εν θεῳ εστιν ειργασμενα* (*τα εργα αυτου*) "He who endeavours to live uprightly and conscientiously, will have a regard to God in all his conduct, will strive to do the will of God, and to promote the divine glory; in short, he will endeavour to conduct himself in a religious manner." *Ποιειν*, (exercere, colere, עָשָׂה,) is used to denote the acting out or manifesting of an attribute or quality of the mind, in other passages also; as is proved in the Dissert. de sensu vocis *δικαιος*, Note 36; see Luke 1: 72, 51. Gen. 24: 12. *Αληθεια* signifies integrity, uprightness; see 1 Cor. 13: 6, where it stands opposed to *αδικια*; and also Prov. 28: 6. *Εργαζεσθαι τα εργα εν θεῳ* may signify 1) to have a regard to God in what we do; see *εν* in Matth. 23: 30. Luke 16: 10, 12. 2 Cor. 8: 18. 2) to do things for God's sake; Matth. 6: 7. 12: 5, *εν τῳ ἱερῳ* for the sake of the temple; see Dissert. I. in librorum N. Test. aliquot loca, p. 34. (*Εν θεῳ* is sometimes used for the simple dative *θεῳ*;[1] as in 2 Cor. 5: 11, *εν ταις συνειδησεσιν*, which words correspond to the simple dative *θεῳ*; and in 8: 1, *εν ταις εκκλησιαις*, in stead of *εκκλησιαις*; and in Acts 4: 12, *δεδομενον εν ανθρωποις*, for *ανθρωποις*. In such cases, the dative has these two significations: *in reference to*, as 1 Cor. 14: 20, *τῃ κακιᾳ*.—2 Cor. 11: 6, *τῳ λογῳ, τῃ γνωσει*.—Rom. 6: 20, *δικαιοσυνῃ*.— 1 Cor. 9: 21. and *on account of*; as in Rom. 14: 6, *κυριῳ*.—1 Cor. 9: 22, *τοις πασι*.[2]) 3) agreeably to the will of God; see Kypke on Rom. 14: 7. and 4)

---

1 See Schleusner's Lex. voc. *εν*, No. 24—27.

2 Compare the passages from Euripides, which are adduced by Kypke, in his Comment. on 2 Cor. 10: 12, p. 266.

to the glory of God; 2 Cor. 5 : 13. The same signification sometimes belongs to the preposition εις, as Kypke (on Luke 12: 21) has shown, from the phrase εις θεον.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The reader may consult, on this subject, the Dissertation on the Object of the death of Jesus, attached to the (author's) Commentary on the Hebrews, p. 684 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The nature of the extraordinary agency of God, in the publication of the Old and New Testaments.

It is to a conviction of the extraordinary agency of God in the promulgation of christianity, that Jesus refers, when he asserts (John 7: 17), that those who strive to perform the will of God, shall know, that he did not derive his doctrines from himself (εξ ἑαυτου); and that they are not so much his doctrines as God's (v. 16, comp. § 6); that is, that they are in the strictest sense divine. Those who infer the divinity of the doctrines of Jesus, solely from their accordance with the dictates of reason; and regard them as of divine origin, in no other sense than that in which all truth is of God; not only make a false appeal to the declarations of Jesus, who asserted the divinity of his doctrines in quite a different sense (John 7: 17); but they also entirely change the point in question. For when, in the discussions of doctrinal theology, we examine the divine origin and authority of the doctrines of Christ, we are not inquiring concerning the truth of the particular doctrines which can be comprehended and proved by human reason; but we are inquiring concerning *a special aid and influence of God*, which it is con-

[1] See Schleusner, on the preposition εις, No. 24. and Kuinöl, Comment. on John 3: 21.

tended that Jesus possessed above all other teachers; an influence, of such a nature as to form a distinct ground of credibility, independent of the visible truth of the doctrines themselves. The question is not, shall we believe the doctrines of Jesus, under the same conditions that we believe the declarations of any other teacher, namely, provided our reason discovers them to be true; but the question is, shall we believe the instructions of Jesus, under circumstances in which we would not credit any other teacher, who was not under the special influence of God; that is, when we cannot be convinced of the truth of the doctrines from visible marks of truth upon them, independently of the authority of the teacher.[1] It is useless to speak of a *Revelation*, if we attribute to Jesus no other inspiration, than what the naturalist will concede to him, and which may just as well be attributed to the Koran, and to every other pretended revelation; nay, to all teachers of religion; that is, if we receive only those doctrines whose truth is manifest to the eye of reason; and call them divine, only because all truth is derived from God the author of our reason. It is not a mere *mediate revelation*, but an *immediate* and *supernatural* one, which is here the subject of inquiry; and the existence of such a revelation must be either asserted, or unconditionally denied. For, to retain the name of Revelation, and yet to believe only in such a mediate revelation as the naturalist will admit, is nothing else than a covert denial of all real revelation. The question is not, whether the doctrines of christianity can be comprehended and proved by reason; but, whether the origin of christianity is divine, in such a sense, that the truth of the christian doctrines can be inferred from the divinity of their origin, no matter whether they can be comprehended by reason or not.[2] For

1 See Observations on Kant's religious philosophy, Note 339.

2 Kant's Religion innerhalb den Gräntzen der blossen Vernunft, S. 217.

the doctrines of christianity might be true, and yet not be a divine revelation; and on the other hand, they may be divinely revealed, and yet reason not be able to perceive their truth from their intrinsic nature.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The basis on which the internal evidence rests.

On this subject, the reader may consult Köppen.[2] It rests on the following principle: "these doctrines, which are of so salutary a nature, so well calculated to promote the health and tranquillity of the soul, to produce a joyful hope, and to urge us on in the path of virtue, and whose influence can be learned only by experience,—these doctrines cannot be derived from any other being than God; for he alone is fully acquainted with the manifold wants and diseases and necessities of the soul of man, and he alone possesses sufficient wisdom and power to discover and to put into operation remedies for them the most efficient and salutary."

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Personal experience.

As we recur to the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, to establish the truth of their testimony concerning the divinity of their mission and doctrines (§ 8, 10, 36); so also each individual can recur to his own personal experience in order to convince himself of the credibility of this testimony. This conviction of the divinity of christianity, which is the result of a proper use of the christian doctrines accompanied by the influence

---

1 See Plank's Introduction to the theological sciences, Pt. I. p. 241, 287, 293, 468. Tüb. gel. Anz. for 1794. No. 17. p. 130, 135. Süskind, on the question, In what sense did Jesus profess that his religious and moral precepts are divine? Tübing. 1812. § 1—6.

2 Sup. cit. Pt. II. p. 285, 287, 307.

of the Holy Spirit, is commonly termed the testimony of the Holy Spirit.[1] But we cannot, as yet, presuppose the cooperation of God during the conscientious use of the christian doctrines; for we are discussing the question of the divinity of those Scriptures, from which the doctrine of the aid of the Holy Spirit must first be proved. (§ 115.)[2]

ILLUSTRATION 6.

The influence of christianity is such as might be expected from a divine revelation.

The fact, that the christian doctrines exert just such an influence as might be expected from doctrines having a divine origin, may at least serve to remove doubts as to the credibility of the testimony of Jesus and his apostles concerning the divinity of their doctrines; it is a negative proof in favour of this testimony. Brenner, in his Historico-philosophical view of Revelation as an introduction to theology,[3] has laid too much stress upon this evidence. Notwithstanding this experience, we may find many difficulties in some of the christian doctrines: and yet he who has given them a careful and conscientious examination, has learned by experience, that many difficulties, which at first looked formidable, disappeared on a closer investigation. And hence he may justly infer, that those points which have hitherto baffled the most profound investigation, are not on that account to be regarded as involved in contradiction or error. And this modesty of judgment will increase, in proportion as a conscientious practical regard to the doctrines and precepts of christianity awakens in the breast a stronger and more lively feeling of their excellence; and it will of itself deter from that

---

1 Morus, Epitom. Theol. Christ. p. 40, 2d ed.

2 Schott's Epitome Theologiae Christianae Dogmaticae, p. 10.

3 Bamberg und Würtzberg, 1810, Th. II. S. 155 &c.

temerity, which would forthwith reject the evidence of the truth of those doctrines whose salutary influence has been learned by experience, on account of some remaining difficulties attending them. A conviction of the salutary influence of the christian doctrines, will make us regard an impartial examination of them and of the evidence of their truth, as a most important and desirable thing; and, consequently, will not suffer us either to let the truth of christianity remain unexamined, or to make unjust demands, or conduct to our investigation with a partial hand.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

The reverence for the inspired writers

Which arises from a perusal of their works, is illustrated by what is said in § 7, where the character of Jesus is adduced as proof of the divinity of his doctrines.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The extent of the evidence of personal experience.

From the nature of this evidence, it necessarily results, that it can have no influence on any, except such as have themselves experienced the salutary influence and power of christianity.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 9.

The reader may consult 1 Thess. 2: 3. 1 Cor. 15:15. and § 8. Illust. 7. as well as Bogue's Essay on the divine authority of the New Testament, translated from the English by Blumhardt, Basel, 1808, ch. 1, 2, where the internal evidence for the divine authority of the New Testament is discussed.

---

[1] See Köppen sup. cit. p. 286, and compare Plank's Introduction, Pt. I. Sect. III. ch. III.

BOOK II.

OF GOD.

PART I.

IDEA OF GOD, AND THE TRUTH OF THIS IDEA.

§ 17. *Even conscience teaches that there is a God.*

Man is led, by the spontaneous impulse of his nature, to prescribe to himself certain rules for the regulation of his conduct. And such is the influence of these prescriptions on him (1), that when he examines(2) his actions by them, although he is far removed from all visible judges of his conduct (3), he excuses or accuses himself, just as if he were arraigned before some visible tribunal (Rom. 2: 14—16. 1: 32) (4). The very constitution of the human soul, therefore, leads us to fear an invisible Judge, who punishes wickedness with misery, and dispenses happiness as the reward of virtue(5).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The influence of the unwritten law.

See Rom. 2: 14. In the preceding (13th) verse, the apostle says, that although the Jews have a written law of God, they are not on that account pleasing to God; on the contrary, as

soon as they transgress the law, the law itself condemns them : *ὁσοι εν τῳ νομῳ ἡμαρτον, δια νομου κριθησονται* (12). He now, in the fourteenth verse, proves the *first proposition* advanced in the twelfth : namely, " that those who have not a written law, may sin and merit punishment," *ὁσα ανομως ἡμαρτον, ανομως και απολουνται.* (For the *γαρ* in v. 13, indicates, that verse 13 contains the proof of what was asserted in the latter member of the 12th verse; but the *γαρ* in verse 14, indicates, that verse 14th contains the proof of the *first member* of the 12th verse. Or, verses 13 and 14 taken in connexion, contain the proof of the whole of verse 12; and this proof is indicated by the *γαρ* twice repeated. *Δε autem* might have been used for one *γαρ;* as appears from a comparison of Matth. 6 : 32 with Luke 12: 30. Such a duplicate *γαρ* occurs also in Phil. 3: 18, 20, where both refer to the exhortation in v. 17).[1] The heathen, (says the apostle, v. 14,) although they have not a written law of God, are a law of God unto themselves; or they have a kind of divine law within them; for, without a written law, they are led by nature alone to do what a law commonly effects; namely, to give themselves commands and prohibitions, and to dispense to themselves rewards and punishments : comp. Rom. 1: 32 and Gal. 3 : 12. That, in the case of the heathen, nature actually supplies the place of a written law (*τα του νομου ποιει*); or, that the commanding influence and authority which

1 Vide Dissert. on the Epistle to the Philipp. ch. 3: 20, note n. (Opuscul. Acad. Vol. I. p. 349 &c.) on the Ep. to the Coloss. 3 : 25, note 61. (Opusc. Acad. Vol. II. p. 202.) This idiom deserves notice, because in other languages the conjunction *for* (enim, *γαρ*) commonly refers only to the proposition immediately preceding, and not to one more remote; and hence, when *γαρ* occurs twice successively, the latter is apt to be viewed as referring to the former, or as containing the proof of a proof; whereas the latter *γαρ* indicates a proof of the same proposition to which the preceding *γαρ* referred.

belong to an outward law (*το εργον του νομου*),[1] do manifest themselves in the heathen, naturally and spontaneously; is proved from the fact, that the conscience of the heathen has precisely the effect of an external law (*συμμαρτυρουσης*[2] *αυτων της συνειδησεως* sc. *αυτῳ*,[3] i. e. *τῳ εργῳ του νομου*),[4] because their own feelings either accuse or excuse them. It appears, therefore, that the apostle proves, from what is called the animadversions of conscience, that there is a law in man, which supplies the place of an outward law, by prescribing to him his duty and threatening him with punishment if he transgress.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Origin of religion, and etymology of the word.

As it is so natural for man to review the train of his past actions, it is not incredible that the word *religion* is derived from *relegere;* and that its primary reference is to that activity of *conscience* which leads us to review the past actions of our

---

[1] On the phrase *το εργον του νομου*, see Cless' "The holy apostle Paul's doctrine of the law," p. 35.

[2] *Συμμαρτυρειν* — to coincide or harmonize with (to confirm) any thing; Rom. 8: 16. Heb. 10: 15.

[3] The ellipsis of the pronoun *αυτῳ*, is illustrated by examples from other texts, in the "Dissertation on some passages of the lesser epistles of Paul," 1792, Note 41.

[4] *Και μεταξυ* &c. this *και* is what is termed the *και εξηγητικον*, which indicates that the sentence following it is only an explanation of the preceding, and which may be translated by *namely*, *or*, nempe, sive. This is its meaning in Mark 15: 1, in the phrase *και ὁλον το συνεδριον* the high priests, and elders, and scribes, *that is* (or *in a word*,) the whole sanhedrim. John 8: 32, "then ye shall be my genuine disciples, *that is* (*και*), ye shall learn to know the truth in such a manner that the truth shall make you free." (Vide Dissert. I. in libror. N. T. histor. aliquot loca, Note 145, in Opusc. Acad. Vol. III.) In "Observv. ad analogiam et syntaxin Ebr." p. 241, are adduced passages from the O. Test. in which the Heb. ו has the same signification.

lives. By those feelings which our consciences excite while we are reviewing our past conduct, we are naturally led on to the idea of a higher power on which we are dependant; and thus we come to acknowledge and reverence a God. In conscience, therefore, we must look for the origin of religion. This derivation of religion, accords with the well known explanation of its origin, as being developed by fear and terror. Cicero says:[1] Qui omnia, quae ad cultum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent, et tanquam retegerent, sunt dicti religiosi.[2] And Gellius[3] quotes from a very ancient poem, the following verse: "Relegentem esse oportet, religiosum nefas." Religiosus is appellabatur, qui nimia et superstitiosa religione sese alligaverat.[4] Terentius Varro,[5] on the contrary, and after him Lactantius,[6] derive the word *religio* from *religare*, or, as the latter expresses himself, "a *vinculo* pietatis, quo Deo obstricti et *religati* sumus," (i. e. from the bond of piety, by which we are bound and *obligated* to God.) And Clodius, in his "Sketch of a system of universal religious doctrine," traces its origin to *relinquere* (to forsake).[7]

ILLUSTRATION 3.

This idea seems to be expressed by the words μεταξυ αλληλων, Rom. 2: 15. The meaning of the apostle seems to be, "The thoughts and feelings of the heathen either excuse or accuse them (the heathen),[8] on account of their secret acts (τα

1 De Nat. Deor. II. 28.

2 [i. e. Those who carefully reviewed, and as it were reconsidered the things which related to worship, were called *religious*. S.]

3 Noct. Attic. IV. 9.

4 [i. e. "To be in the habit of reviewing our conduct, is proper; but it is criminal to be religious;" for those were termed religious, who burdened themselves by an excessive and superstitious religion. S.]

5 De lingua Latina, Lib. V. p. 68. ed. Bip.

6 Instit. Div. IV. 28. 7 p. 11. Note 6, Leipsic, 1808.

8 Here αυτους must again be supplied; comp. Illust. 1. note 3.

κρυπτα των ανθρωπων, v.16) with one another only, i. e. without any one from without to awaken those feelings." Comp. Matth. 18: 15. Koppe, in his "Commentary on the epistle to the Romans," p. 54, explains the passage thus: "Their own principles shall hereafter accuse or excuse them &c." He takes αλληλων as synonymous with ἑαυτων, and μεταξυ with επειτα postea. But to make αλληλων equivalent to ἑαυτων in the signification *own*, is unauthorized; notwithstanding, ἑαυτων may be substituted for αλληλων, as in Eph. 4: 32, (χαριζομενοι ἑαυτοις,) where ἑαυτοις is put for αλληλοις. The word μεταξυ has indeed the signification *afterwards*, which Koppe here adopts, (as in Acts 13: 42);[1] yet, in this place, the genitive αλληλων proves, that μεταξυ is a preposition and not an adverb, and consequently that it cannot be connected with the subsequent words εν ἡμερᾳ, as Koppe proposes.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The agency of conscience proves a future judgment.

Those who are acquainted with the doctrine of the Gospel, that God has determined to bring all the secret acts of men before a judgment, which is to be held by Jesus Christ; can discover the cause of that wonderful inward agency. It is because of this future time (εν ἡμερᾳ propter tempus)[3] of a judgment to come, because we must render an account to God for all our thoughts and actions; that God has implanted that activity in our consciences which is described in the 15th verse.

---

1 Kypke, in his note on Acts 13: 42, has proved this signification of μεταξυ, by passages from Plutarch; and Krebs, by quotations from Josephus. Comp. Schleusner's Lex. on this word, No. 3.

2 Another explanation of the words μεταξυ αλληλων, is: inter se, vicissim, alternis vicibus (Grotius, Wetstein); Schott (vers. Lat. N. T.): sententiae (de pravo et honesto) consuetudine mutua utentes.

3 On the import of εν, compare § 16. Illust. 1.

If a sense of dependance on an invisible judge were not implanted in us, we should be lulled to rest, by the reflection that we have taken the course we chose, and that no one is able to punish us for it. Of our own inability to reward virtue and punish vice, we are convinced, by our experience of our own weakness and inability to direct external circumstances according to our will.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

This moral dictation is founded on the original structure of the human soul.

See Kant's work entitled, Kritik der Urtheilskraft.[1] The passage which more especially refers to this subject, is this: "Suppose the case of a person, at a time when his moral sensibility is most acute and active; suppose, that in this state of mind he finds himself under the pressure of duties which he can perform only by some voluntary sacrifice, and that this sacrifice he resolves to make; he now feels within him a conviction, that he has done something which was commanded to be done, that he has yielded obedience to a sovereign ruler. Or if he has unintentionally violated his duty, although he does not thereby become responsible to a human tribunal, the language of his strong selfcondemnation will resemble the language of a judge, to whom he must render an account for that violation of duty." Compare Jacobi's "Easy and convincing proof of the existence of God, and of the truth of the christian religion," p. 15 &c. and especially the same author's work entitled, "An attempt to prove, that there is in the human soul, a natural impression of God and of a future life."[2]

---

1 § 86. Note, p. 416 &c.

2 Sämmtliche Schriften, Theil II. Num. III, IV. S. 441 &c.

§ 18.

Physico-theological and moral proof of the existence of God.— The combination of both.

Although we cannot behold God with our bodily eyes, yet to the eye of our mind he is by no means invisible, *τα αοραται αυτου νοουμενα καθοραται* the invisible things of him, being understood, are seen; for since the creation of the world, the invisible Creator stands revealed by his works, Rom. 1 : 20. And the farther we advance in our investigations of nature, the more numerous and striking are the marks (1) which we discover, of system and of adaptation to an end (2). And there is in fact no excuse, in the sight of him who has revealed himself to us in the works of nature, for the stubborn scepticism which can doubt whether this system and adaptation were produced by the agency of a rational and intelligent Being, or were the result of a blind mechanism, Rom. 1 : 20, *εις το ειναι αυτους αναπολογητους*, comp. 2 Thess. 1 : 8. For, although we cannot fully demonstrate the impossibility of a blind mechanism (3); still we, who are rational beings, and whose superiority over other creatures consists chiefly in our reason and our ability to adapt our conduct to particular ends, cannot possibly admit, that the cause which produced the world and gave us our reason, should have no semblance of rationality, but should be an irrational something. Indeed such an admission would be utterly inconsistent with our conscious feeling of the dignity of our own natures, Acts 17: 28 &c. Ps. 94 : 8 —10. Moreover, to admit the existence of a rational Author of the world of which we are a part,

is the more consistent with our nature, because we feel within us a natural dread of an invisible Judge of our actions and motives; whom we must of course believe to be a rational Being, unless we are willing, in defiance of our own consciences, to pronounce that inward feeling which leads us to dread such a Judge, a delusion. Now, as this feeling of accountability unavoidably leads us to the idea that *we are dependant on a rational Being*, it would manifestly be in itself inexcusable, and would militate against our own inward feelings, if we should give way to that obstinate unbelief, which, instead of acknowledging a rational Being as the great first cause of all things, looks upon the wise and intelligent constitution of nature as the result of a mere blind mechanism. Reason, in her attempts to account for the system and adaptation of nature, is compelled to admit the existence of a rational Author of creation (4); and conscience compels us to believe, that we who are a part of this creation are dependant on a superhuman rational Being. How then can we, notwithstanding all these proofs, and in violation of the constitution of our own minds (5), resist the belief of a rational Author of creation, to whom alone we can refer (6) those feelings of gratitude which arise within us while enjoying the bounties of nature, and from whom alone we can expect those righteous retributions for our good and bad actions which our consciences lead us so confidently to anticipate? (7) Heb. 11: 6. Rom. 2: 6—10. It is also evident, that the Judge and Lord of our moral nature, is one and the same Being with the Lord of the rest of creation; (which, as is evinced by its peculiar and wise adaptation to such an end, must have been formed for the use of rational and moral beings) (8); for otherwise we

must suppose it possible, that the arrangements in the external world, might prevent our moral Judge (who on this supposition would be distinct from the author of nature) from fulfilling those promises and executing those threatenings (9) which he has made known to us through the instrumentality of our consciences. Moreover, while our nature strongly leads us to desire happiness, our reason as strongly enjoins obedience to law, and teaches, that obedience and happiness are most intimately connected (§ 17); but it is impossible to conceive, how obedience can be united with happiness in the performance of duties which require selfdenial (10), unless we admit that the whole creation, as well as ourselves, is under the controul of a moral Governor (11). Therefore, unless we would be at variance with ourselves (12); unless we would have the inextinguishable desire of our nature for happiness(13), frequently to be at variance (1 Cor. 15: 32) with that law, whose sanctity and authority we can never deny, except in the blind rage of passion; we are compelled to admit that supposition, which best accounts for our inward feelings of reverence for a Judge of our thoughts and actions, and for the order and adaptation visible in the material world; in other words, we must admit the existence of a moral Author and Governor of the universe (14). And it would indeed be a great departure from wisdom, if we should be so obstinate in our unbelief as to take refuge in the groundless and absurd hypothesis, "that we are perhaps deceived by our nature and by the objects around us" (15), thus rejecting the only supposition which accords with our nature, and with the nature of the objects that surround us.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The physico-theological evidence is cumulative.

The fact, that "the farther we advance in our investigations of nature, the more numerous and striking are the marks which we find of system and adaptation to an end," justifies the expectation, that in those cases where such marks have not yet been observed, some future day will bring them to light. The same fact also forcibly inculcates a modesty and wisdom that will not at once regard as proper grounds for skepticism those things in nature which seem to be inconsistent with the wisdom of the Author of creation; but will rather, from the acknowledged perfection of the works of creation, as far as they are known to us, infer, that equal excellence belongs to those parts of the creation with which we are not yet well acquainted. Hence, it is reasonable, as Kant admits, to ascribe every possible perfection to the Creator of the universe.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Physico-theological proof of the divine existence.

The reader may consult, on this subject, the works of Kant,[1] Reimarus,[2] Werenfels,[3] and Dahlenberg.[4]

The principal features of the physico-theological proof, as they are briefly presented by Kant, in his "Critique on pure reason,"[5] are the following:

---

1 Kritik der Urtheilskraft, § 63—67. p. 275 &c.

2 Discussion of the principal truths of natural religion, 6th edit.

3 Opuscula, Pt. II. p. 255 &c.

4 Philosophy of religion and nature, 3 vols. 1797–98. And the latest treatise on the physico-theological proof, in the work entitled, "Pyrrho and Philalethes, or Does skepticism lead to truth and satisfactory decision?" Sultzbach, 1812.

5 p. 653 &c. 2d ed.

1. We find every where in our world, manifest marks of adaptation to specific ends, works executed with great wisdom, and forming a whole of indescribable multiplicity as well as of unbounded extent.

2. This systematic adaptation of things is not essential to their nature; that is, if there were no rational agent who selected, adapted, and arranged them, so many different things could not, by their own inherent power, have brought themselves to harmonize for the accomplishment of specific ends, as they now do.

3. There exists, therefore, one exalted and wise cause (or more than one), which produced this world, not as an omnipotent nature acting blindly by its generative fecundity, but by intelligence and volition.

4. The *unity* of this cause may be inferred from the unity of adaptation in the multifarious parts of the world, as in the parts of a well planned edifice. As far as our observation extends, this inference of the unity of the cause, amounts to certainty; and beyond the sphere of our observation, the same inference is derived with probability, from every principle of analogy.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Whether a blind mechanism can be proved impossible.

Kant says: We must first prove the impossibility of a unity of object in matter, derived from the mere mechanical powers of its nature, before we can be justified in ascribing that unity explicitly to something beyond nature as its cause. But we can arrive at nothing more than this: that according to our limited powers of conception, and our ability to judge, we can by no means expect to find in mere matter, a principle or cause producing such adaptations to specific ends; and that to us, there remains no other method of accounting for such a formation of the material

world, than to refer it to one Supreme Intelligence, the cause of all things." Kritik der Urtheilskraft.[1]

Compare Garve's posthumous Dissertation on the existence of God, (reprinted from the Vth part of his Essays on various subjects &c.) 1802, Sect. 6.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The adaptation in nature can be explained only on the supposition of an intelligent cause.

Compare Kritik der Urtheilskraft, in the passage above quoted (Illust. 3). The following passages also relate to this subject: "The glorious order, beauty, and foresight which shine forth from every part of nature, must, alone, have produced the belief of a great and wise Author of creation, as far as such belief rests on proofs from reason." (Critique on pure Reason, 2d ed. preface, p. XXXIII.) And in the same work, p. 651 &c. "This proof (the physico-theological) deserves at all times to be mentioned with respect; it is the oldest, clearest, and best adapted to the common sense of mankind. It prompts to the study of nature, which is its source, and which constantly gives new force to it. The attempt would therefore be no less discouraging than fruitless, to endeavour to detract from the worth of this proof. Reason is constantly receiving new strength and confidence from such powerful and, under her hand, ever growing proofs; and it is not in the power of any doubts of subtile and abstruse speculation, to depress her so far, that she should not, in every instance, by a glance at the wonders of nature and the majesty of the universe, tear herself loose from perplexing indecision, as from the phantoms of a dream, and rise in her contemplations from greatness to greatness, from that which is mediate or conditional, to the immediate and uncaus-

[1] § 73—78. p. 328. also p. 324 &c.

ed Author of all things." And the passage in the work: "Was heist, sich im Denken orientiren?" (Berlin Monthly Publication, 1786): "Unless we admit the existence of a rational Creator, we can assign no reason, or at least no intelligible one, for the system and adaptation which we every where find in so wonderful a degree, without falling into direct inconsistencies. And although we are not able to prove the impossibility, that such an adaptation should exist without a rational first cause; still the assumption of such impossibility, is justified by the fact, that reason finds herself necessitated to presuppose something which is intelligible to her, in order to explain these phenomena; as nothing else can relieve her from her embarrassment." Comp. Garve's Dissert. above quoted, Pt. 7.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

"Such is the peculiar constitution of our minds, that we are not able to understand or form any conception of the adaptation in the objects in nature, in any other manner, than by viewing them and the world in general as the production of a rational cause, that is, of a God."[1]

ILLUSTRATION 6.

"In the moments when the sensibility of our moral feelings is most acute and active, when we are surrounded by nature arrayed in all her beauties, and feel the calm serene enjoyment of our existence; we feel within us a conviction that we ought to be grateful to some being for these blessings."[2]

---

[1] Kant, Kritik der Urtheilskraft, § 75. p. 332 &c. See also Vogel's Dissertation on the theoretico-practical evidence of the existence of a God, in the New Theol. Journ. of Gabler, for 1799, Vol. I. p. 22. comp. that for 1800, Vol. II. p. 34. and Mag. für christliche Dog. und Moral. Stück XII. S. 151 &c.

[2] Kant sup. cit. § 86, p. 86. note, p. 411. comp. § 91, p. 472.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

We must either admit, that the constitution of universal nature is in harmony with the promises and threatenings of our consciences; or we are compelled, in direct opposition to the voice of conscience, to pronounce that fear and that hope which are so deeply rooted in our moral nature, either fallacious or uncertain.[1] On the other hand it is evident, that if the ultimate and chief object of the adaptation in nature be not a *moral* one, that adaptation can have no object at all.[2] It is therefore a dictate of our nature, that we and the other objects in the world are subject to a *moral Governor*. And the man who should refuse to admit the existence of a moral rational Ruler of the world, because he is not able to see him with his bodily eyes, and cannot demonstrate his existence by absolutely irresistable proofs, but must admit it by an act of faith; would, to say the least, act in contradiction to his own moral nature. His conduct would be just as inexcusable, as that of the man who is suffering the consequences of some misfortune, which he might have foreseen and by the use of proper measures have obviated, but who, although the evidence of his danger amounted to the strongest probability, would not believe it, because it did not amount to absolute certainty.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

See Gen. 1: 26 &c. Matth. 6: 26, 30. 10: 30 &c. 1 Cor. 3: 21 &c. Rom. 8: 19, 21. These passages teach, that the world was created for the sake of rational beings.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Kritik der Urtheilskraft, § 91. p. 457.

---

1 Kant sup. cit. § 87. p. 414 &c. 429, 433.

2 Crit. &c. § 86. p. 405 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

See Matth. 5: 10 &c. 1 Pet. 3: 14. 2 Thess. 1: 4. 1 Cor. 15: 30, 31. All these passages refer to such duties as are connected with great sacrifices.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

See Matth. 5: 10 &c. 2 Thess. 1: 5—7. The retribution referred to in these two passages, presupposes a moral Governor of the world. See Jacob, On the moral evidence of the existence of God; and his Proof of the immortality of the soul from the idea of duty. Böck, de limite officiorum humanorum, seposita animorum immortalitate, Sect. II, Tübingen, 1791. Hauff, Dialogus: an sint officia, ad quae hominem natura obligatum esse, demonstrari nequeat, seposita animorum immortalitate?

ILLUSTRATION 12.

See Flatt's "Contributions on the subject of christian doctrines and practice," No. II. in the investigation of the question: "What is the relation in which the hope of that future happiness promised by the Gospel of Jesus, stands to virtue," p. 99 &c. Annotationes ad Kantii philosophicam de religione doctrinam, § X, XI. Magazine for christian doctrine &c. Pt. 7. p. 93. and Pt. 12. 158 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

"To be happy, is necessarily the strong desire of every rational finite being; and must therefore inevitably have an influence on the determinations of his will." Kant's Critique on practical reason, p. 45. Comp. Brastberger, on "The ground of our faith in God and of our knowledge of him," Stuttgard,

1802. Supplement I. "Uber den Streit des Purismus und Eudaemonismus in der Sittenlehre," p. 110 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 14.

We are compelled to admit the existence of a moral Governor of the world.

See Critique on all Revelations, § 2. (2d ed. § 3.) and Remarks on Kant's philosophy of religion.

Compare Kern, "The doctrine of God according to the principles of the critical philosophy," Ulm, 1796, § 71 &c. Stäudlin's "Contributions to the philosophy and history of religion and the science of morals," Vol. III. No. 2. "On the moral ground of the critical philosophy." also Brastberger's "Brief and plain view of the evidence of the existence of God, derived from the concomitance of virtue and happiness," in his treatise "On the ground of our belief in God," p. 19—48. To this argument for the existence of God from the connexion between virtue and happiness, a notion has of late been opposed, similar to the ancient Stoical idea, that virtue is its own reward. Eckermann, in the "Theologische Beitrage,"[1] has attempted to show, that virtue always brings along with her a sufficient degree of contentment. And Abicht, in the "Doctrine of rewards and punishments,"[2] has erected a theory of rewards and punishments, on the principle, that the reward of virtue is nothing else than the pleasure which is connected with the consciousness of our self-acquired dignity; and that punishment is nothing else than the unpleasant feelings resulting from the consciousness of our self-occasioned degradation. Compare what is said in refutation of this theory, and of the inference which follows from it; namely, that this idea of the reward and punish-

[1] Vol. III. Pt. I. p. 82 &c.

[2] Erlangen, 1796. Pt. I.

ment of virtue and vice, does not necessarily lead to the belief of a moral Governor of the world; in the "Examination of a new theory of rewards and punishments," in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. 2, No. VI.

Another and a somewhat different aspect, which has lately been given to this moral evidence of the existence of God, is this: If we would expect to realize that happiness which our conscience (or our reason) leads us to anticipate, then we must believe in a moral Governor of the world, that is, in a God. See Stäudlin's Beiträge sup. cit. Vol. III. Fichte's and Forberg's Dissertations, in the Philosoph. Journal, 1798, 1st part. Fichte's "Appeal to the public." Forberg's "Apology for his reputed atheism," 1799. "Letters on Kant's, Forberg's, and Fichte's Religious Theory," in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. V. letter 2, 3. In like manner, Schmidt (in his "Elements of christian doctrine," Giesen, 1800) grounds the belief of the existence of God (§ 39 &c.) and of religion in general (§ 1 &c.), on the requisitions of conscience, or the moral principle. "In that course of moral conduct which conscience demands, obstacles present themselves which our power is unable to surmount. If then they are to be surmounted, we must admit the existence of a power, which so arranges things that these impediments shall infallibly be overcome; that is, we must admit the existence of a moral Author and Governor of the world, *a God*."

Fichte does indeed, set out with the same principle: that for the success of virtue, we must look to an active, rational being; but in his reasoning, he admits only a *moral constitution* of the world, without referring this constitution to a *moral Governor*. See the Dissertation in the Philosoph. Journal sup. cit. and the Appeal to the public. Compare what has been said in opposition to this theory, in a multitude of publications, among which the following only need be named; Heusinger "Uber

das idealistisch—atheistische system Fichte's, Dresden, 1799. Jacobi to Fichte, Hamburg, 1799. Flatt's Magazine, Pt. 5. No. 1, on Fichte's doctrine of God and the divine government of the world. "Letters on Fichte's, Kant's, and Forberg's Theory of religion, being an impartial examination of it," in Flatt's Mag. Pt. 6. No. 6. Also Köppen, "On Revelation in reference to Kant's and Fichte's Philosophy," 2d ed. 1802. p. 127 &c. Compare the Notice of 21 publications for and against Fichte's doctrine concerning God, in Gabler's "New Theol. Journal," Vol. 5, Pt. 3. p. 217—240. Pt. 4. p. 366—392.[1]

Forberg builds his sceptical atheism on the principle, "that religion, as far as attention to it can be a duty, consists merely in conducting ourselves as if there were a moral government and a moral Governor of the world; but, that there really is a moral constitution of the world and a God, we may believe or not as we please; for it cannot be ascertained." Compare what is said against this theory, in the Letters on Kant's, Forberg's, and Fichte's theory of Religion, above referred to; and the Review of Forberg's Apology, in "Tübingen Gelehrten Anz." 1800, Pt. 42—44.

ILLUSTRATION 15.

See Brastberger's "Investigation of Kant's Critique on pure reason," — and "On Kant's Critique upon practical reason," especially p. 212—219. "On the ground of our belief in God and of our knowledge of him," p. 84—99, where the subjective necessity of believing in the existence of a God, is fully discussed, and derived from several proofs founded in our nature. (On this *subjective* necessity, Vogel rests his "Theoretico-practical proof of the objective existence of God," in Gabler's

1 On Fichte's later doctrine concerning God, which he proposes in his his "Guide to a blessed eternity," see Fries, "Fichte's and Schelling's new doctrine of God and the world," Heidelberg, 1807, p. 7—22.

"New Theol. Journal," Vol. 15. p. 19 &c. 109 &c.) In the last mentioned work of Brastberger, (p. 92—94, note,) the result of his investigation is given, in the following passage: "We find ourselves and every thing around us, to the utmost extent of our observation, standing in such numerous relations and references to each other, and in such a coherent systematic connexion, that the idea of an intentional adaptation to rational purposes, according to universal laws, or of a physical and moral world, is irresistably forced upon us. But the existence of such an order of things, we can rationally ascribe only to an *intelligence* which superintends and arranges all things and events, to *a rational mind* which selects and acts with an intelligent reference to ends. Consequently, we must suppose the primary and absolute cause of all things to be a rational and moral Intelligence. — Although this reasoning proves only the necessity of our *conceiving* the idea of a God, and of our *supposing* that he really exists, (for no proof can possibly establish the necessity of the existence of a thing itself, but only the necessity of our believing and conceiving it to exist,) still it is perfectly satisfactory. It perfectly justifies us in entertaining a rational belief in a God; for we are brought to this alternative: we must either believe there is a God; or we must believe, that every thing of which we have any knowledge, even we ourselves and all our thoughts, conceptions, and existence, are empty incomprehensible legerdemain; in truth, a *nothing* floating about in the bottomless profundity of *nothing*"!!

Vogel, in his Theoretico-practical evidence of the objective existence of God,[1] advances this idea: "Man is compelled by a subjective, theoretical and practical necessity of his reason, to assert the objective existence of God; and of this objective

[1] In Gabler's New Theolog. Journal for 1799, Vol. I. p. 19—34, 109—154. and in that for 1800, Vol. II. p. 17—54.

existence of God, he is as certain as of the existence of those objects which he perceives through his senses; for he has the same evidence for the existence of both; namely, that his reason is compelled [by a subjective necessity] to believe it; and this must ever be his only criterion of truth."

Süskind, in his dissertation "On the evidence of the existence of God, as a self-existent Intelligence, distinct from the world," gives a similar derivation of our belief in the existence of God.[1] The general tenour of his reasoning is as follows: "To take it for granted, that we are not deceived by our reason; is indeed an assumption, the truth of which we cannot prove; but, at the same time, it is one which, as rational beings, we must necessarily make. The plain dictates of reason, that is, those dictates which originate from the essential nature and activity of our reason, are therefore, of indisputable certainty and truth. And their validity extends, not only to the *appearances* of things, but also to the *things themselves* to which these appearances refer; nay, it extends even to things which are not objects of sense; so far as the general and essential principles of reason oblige us to form judgments concerning them or to bring them under our consideration. To attempt to prove, that the laws of our reason are not applicable to things themselves, would be an attempt to prove, that we are deluded by reason: the attempt itself, therefore, would involve a self-contradiction; for the proof would have to be conducted by the aid of reason, and would necessarily presuppose that very validity of reason, which it was intended to overthrow. To these pure dictates of reason, belong those of a *theoretical*, as well as those of a *practical* nature. The former include the principles of unity and of contradiction, the principles of causality and adaptation, viz.

[1] Magazine für Christliche Dogmatik und Moral, Stück 12. § XXIII—XXXVIII, and § XLVII—LVIII.

that the chain of dependencies must have an absolute first cause, and the principle, that every thing which exists is either substance or accident. The latter include those principles in all men, according to which reason determines what is unconditionally good. It would be inconsistent, to acknowledge the validity of the latter only, while we doubt or deny that of the former; for it is the same reason, which in the one case determines what is good, and in the other, what is true. It is therefore impossible to have a consistent (i. e. a *rational*) belief of the validity of the *practical* principles of reason, without also admitting the validity of its *theoretical* dictates. But it is on these theoretical and practical principles of reason, which are also decisive for the actual existence of ourselves and of the visible world, that the rational belief of a God, as a self-existent Intelligence, distinct from the world, as an intelligent and holy Author of the world, is founded.

NOTE. *On a late pantheistic hypothesis concerning God.*

The doctrine concerning God, taught in the System of absolute identity, is inculcated and explained by its author, in the following works: Schelling's "Bruno; or On the divine and natural *first principle* of things," Berlin, 1802. "Magazine for Speculative Physics," Vol. I. Pt. 2, Jena, 1801. "New Magazine for Speculative Physics," Vol. I. Pt. 1, 2, Tübingen, 1803. "Lectures on the course of Academic Study," Tübingen, 1803. "Philosophy and Religion," Tübingen, 1804. "A view of the true relation of the philosophy of nature to the improved doctrines of Fichte," Tübingen, 1806. "Philosophical investigations relative to the freedom of man, and the subjects connected with it," (in his philosophical works, Landshut, 1809, p. 399—511). "Denkmal der Schrift von den göttlichen Dingen des Herrn Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, Tübingen, 1812.

Agreeably to the representation of the last two works, God is *that being which evolved itself* out of a principle or ground of existence found in God himself, (out of a nature in God,) or out of a principle, which is indeed not intelligent, not moral, not perfect, in itself, but which nevertheless contains in embryo and locked up within itself, intelligence, morality, and perfection (which, however, are only potentiâ, only implicitè intelligent and moral and perfect); *by means of* a series of creations (self-manifestations of God), by which nature was exalted and spiritualized, until it evolved itself into the most perfect personal Being (Deus explicitus, *Deus* sensu eminenti): or, God is the *absolute identity of the ideal and the real*, evolving itself *from the original absolute confusion of the ideal and real*. This absolute confusion, the original ground itself, is neither ideal nor real; yet divides itself into the two equally eternal principles of the ideal and real; and out of the combination of both (by means of the subordination of the real to the ideal, by the transmutation of the real into the ideal,) arises *absolute identity*, that is, *God*.

The principal objections to this doctrine concerning God, are the following:

1. This theory does not account for the existence of God.

2. This theory does not render the existence of God, in the least degree, more comprehensible or intelligible than the common one, which supposes him to have existed as an all-perfect Being, from the beginning.

3. This hypothesis forces our idea of God, (which is absolute,) into forms; and subjects it to laws which can apply only to finite things, to the visible world. God is considered to be of the same essence as the material world.

4. It really subjects God, during his self-manifestations, to the power of a supreme fate, of an original supreme and self-existent law.

5. The assertion, that God could not, from the beginning, exist as an all-perfect Being, cannot be proved. It is founded on

(a) The general principle, that the less perfect cannot proceed from the more perfect; but vice versa, the latter from the former (non fumus ex fulgore, sed fulgor ex fumo). But even if this were a universal law of nature, it could not on that account be applied to the relation of the Creator to the world.

(b) Upon this principle: "Had God, from the beginning, actually been possessed of the highest degree of perfection, as he could not attain a higher degree of excellence, he would have had no reason for creating and bringing into existence such a multitude of objects, by which he could only have been rendered less perfect."—But agreeably to the assertion of the author of this system himself, *love* is the ground or reason of the creation of the world; and to create it, was condescension in God. This accords equally well with the common opinion, that God existed from the beginning as the all-perfect Being. Nor could he, by creating the world, suffer any diminution of his perfection; provided we consider creation as an incomprehensible act of the omnipotence of God, and unattended by any communication of his essence to the creatures.

On the other hand, the hypothesis, that from a principle which is in itself not moral and not intelligent, God evolves himself into the most perfect Being; is encumbered with insuperable difficulties and objections.

(a) If God has exalted himself into the most perfect Being, only at the end of time; then neither the creation nor the government of the world is the work of perfect wisdom, goodness, and holiness.

(b) This evolution of God would be an evolution from finite into infinite; and yet finite and infinite are *toto genere* different.

6. The *immanence of all things in God*, which is asserted by this hypothesis, destroys the individuality and substantiality of the creatures; contradicts what we know to be a fact, that distinct substances exist together in the world; and leads to the identification and confounding of the creature with the Creator.

The idea of an absolute, an independant *first cause* of the world, is the ultimate conception of our minds; and in this alone can the eternal *unity of all things* be imagined. (*In* and *by* must be distinguished with care, if we would express our idea of Deity with precision.)

7. This system destroys the freedom of the will of man; for freedom cannot consist with this immanence in God;

8. And thereby it destroys the distinction between moral good and evil.

The reader may consult the following dissertations and works: Süskind, "On the grounds for belief of the existence of a God as a self-existent Intelligence distinct from the world; in reference to the latest system of absolute identity," (in his Mag. für christliche Dogmatik und Moral, Stück 11. S. 143 &c. Stück 12. S. 24 &c.—But especially, the same author's work, entitled, "An Examination of Schelling's doctrines concerning God, the creation, freedom, and moral good and evil." This work takes up the most recent views of these doctrines, as represented in the two last works above mentioned, and discusses at large the greater part of the objections above stated. Vogel, "On Schelling's religious doctrines," in Gabler's Journal for select theological literature, Vol. V. p. 1—49. Stäudlin's "Lehrbuch der dogmatik," 3te Ausgabe, S. 179 &c. Fries, "On Fichte's and Schelling's new doctrines concerning God and the world," Heidelberg, 1807, p. 23 &c. Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, von den göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbahrung, Leipsic, 1811, S. 116 &c.

It is against this work of Jacobi, that Schelling wrote his Denkmal. Fries, Von Deutscher Philosophie Art und Kunst, Heidelberg, 1812, p. 54 &c.

On Jacobi's idea of immediate rational belief in God, proceeding from internal revelation; see the Letters of that author, on Spinoza's doctrine, Leipsic, 1786. Jacobi, "On Idealism and Realism," Breslau, 1787. His "Letters to Fichte," Hamburg, 1799. and his work, "Von den göttlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbahrung," Leipsic, 1811. Köppen's "Exposition of the true essence of Philosophy," Nurenberg, 1810, § 1—3, 8, 11, 19. comp. Fries, von Deutcher Philosophie Art und Kunst, S. 38 &c. Weiss, "On the living God and the way of being received into his presence," Leipsic, 1812, Beilage, I. S. 179 &c.

§ 19.

The evidence of the divine existence, corroborated by the miracles of Christ.

The method above stated, for arriving at a conviction of the existence of God, is of such a nature, that it would not be strange, if God should, by other clear and striking proofs, facilitate (1) that evolution of our finer moral feelings which is presupposed in that method. Such proofs we actually have in the miracles (2) of Jesus and his apostles (3), the truth and importance of which have already been established, § 5, 8, 10 at the end. Those miracles were such effects as human agents could never have produced, by their own intelligence and power; and therefore necessarily presuppose an

invisible cause. And this invisible cause must have been rational; for not only are we ourselves able to discover (4) certain objects for which they were wrought, but the history of them, and the express declarations of those who performed them, assign to them definite objects (5). Now, according to the declaration of Jesus and his apostles, that rational Cause, whose superhuman power is proved from the very nature of these miracles (6), was God, or the Creator and Lord of nature. (For, this is the description of the divine character which Jesus and his apostles give, deriving it from the Old Testament, the authority of which they acknowledged, see § 20.) And we have no reason to look for any other cause of those miracles, different from that assigned by Jesus and his apostles; especially as the arguments which have been adduced (§ 18) for our belief in the existence of God, render their declarations credible. God has then, in the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, manifested his agency (Acts 14: 9—11. comp. v. 15), and corroborated the other proofs of his existence (v. 17). This proof of the divine existence, taken in connexion with that above stated (§ 18), would not be wholly divested of force, even if we were to admit the unauthorized supposition, that the miracles of Christ and his apostles were wrought by some other being. For, on this supposition, we should have to admit, that the other being, who must necessarily have been rational and superhuman, did himself ascribe the miracles and doctrines of Christ and his apostles (§ 8, 6) to the Creator and Lord of nature. In this case, then, a belief in the existence of God, would be supported by the testimony of at least one superhuman being, and would no longer be a weakness peculiar to man.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Köppen, in "The Bible a work of divine wisdom,"[1] proves, that the revelation which God has given us in nature, by no means renders a supernatural revelation of his invisible greatness and power superfluous.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

On this evidence for the existence of God, see Michaelis, "Dogmatik;"[2] and in Flatt's Beiträge,[3] "Remarks on the proof for the existence of God, derived from the Bible, and especially from the doctrines and history of Jesus."

On the question, "Are proofs of the objective existence of God, necessary, in popular and practical religious instruction," see Bauer's Dissertation in Flatt's Magazine.[4]

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The existence of God proved by miracles.

We have in this case selected the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, as the ground of evidence, because the truth of the Old Testament miracles is to be proved by the authority of Jesus and his apostles.[5] But if we contemplate more attentively, the grounds for belief in the existence of a God, which our own nature contains; we shall not view as superfluous, the fact stated in the Old Testament, that God himself, by his immediate influence, and in various ways, did awaken and cherish and strengthen, not only in the first persons of our race, but also in their descendants, those nobler feelings, which produce a belief in the existence of God as the supreme rewarder of all good,[6]

---

1 Pt. I. p. 39. 2d ed. p. 41 &c. 2 § 24. p. 146.

3 Num. I. p. 7 &c. 4 Pt. VI. No. V. 5 See § 13.

6 Heb. 11: 6. See, in Hess' "Bibliothek of sacred history," 2d part, the Dissert.: "The natural views of God given in the Scriptures, considered in their relation to the revealed views of the divine Being," p. 119—149. De Maree's "Defence of God's permission of evil," Pt. I. p. 115 &c.

In this manner God actually instructed some individuals, who were to instruct others, in the knowledge of his character as creator[1] of the world, and of the necessity of obedience to him in order to the enjoyment of happiness.[2] Examples of this are found in Gen. 2: 17. 3: 8 &c. 4: 6 &c. 6: 3. 15: 1. 17: 1. By their own experience of the fulfilment of his promises and threats, he habituated them to a belief in him.[3] Such were the promise made to Abraham of a numerous posterity,[4] the promise of the land of Canaan,[5] the threatening of a flood and its fulfilment.[6] By the public miracles, which God wrought among the Israelites and the people around them, he made it evident, to those who saw and heard those miracles, that there was an invisible Lord of creation,[7] who was able to execute the promises and denunciations of their own consciences.[8] See the declarations of God relative to such miracles, in Exod. 7 : 5. 8: 6, 18. 9: 14. Deut. 4: 32—39. Dan. ch. 2—6. Ex. 9: 16. Josh. 2: 11. 4: 23, 24. Facts, therefore, were the means by which that belief in the existence of God, as the Creator and Ruler of the world, to which even our own nature urges us, was anciently confirmed. And although these miracles were not witnessed by all men, nor indeed could be, without impairing their force, still the knowledge of them was transmitted by tradition to succeeding generations,[9] and in various ways was also spread among foreign nations.[10] ("For," says Köppen,[11] "if

---

1 Gen. ch. 1. 2 Gen. 18: 19.

3 Heb. 11: 1, 2, 7—19. Compare the five Programms of Morus on the knowledge of religion which is connected with attention to facts in our own experience. Dissert. Theologicae et Philologicae, Vol. II. N.I—V.

4 Gen. 15: 4—6. 17: 15 &c. compare ch. 21.

5 Gen. 15: 7 &c. Exod. 3: 6 &c. 6: 2—8. 6 Gen. 6: 7.

7 Exod. 9: 29.

8 See Köppen sup. cit. Pt. II. p. 180 &c. (2d ed. p. 194 &c.)

9 Exod. 10: 2. 10 See, e. g. 2 K. 5: 2—15.

11 Sup. cit. p. 47 &c. (2d edit. p. 58 &c.)

such extraordinary acts were performed amongst all nations, and at all times, or if they were only frequently repeated; it would become matter of doubt, whether they were not the natural effects of some hidden powers of nature. They would become common and familiar, like the ordinary phenomena of nature, and thus would make little impression; and by this means the object of them would be frustrated, and they would be no proofs of a revelation from God.") Now these miracles might contribute much to promote the knowledge of God, even among those who had heard only vague rumours of them, or had even not heard of them at all. For the idea of a God, which these numerous manifestations of divine agency imparted to the eye-witnesses of these divine acts, was through them communicated to other families or nations with whom they came in contact, and thus was brought into general circulation. And as soon as the idea of a God has been communicated to a person from without, all the declarations of his own conscience and the instructions of nature around him, become, even without any new external proofs of the divine existence, much more comprehensible and efficient.[1] Nor can we doubt that God, whose providence extends to the times and the places of habitation of all men,[2] would cause that those who had a more perfect knowledge of him, should be brought into connexion with others of humbler attainments, so that the latter might have an opportunity to "seek the Lord," *ζητειν τον θεον*, Acts 17:27. For although God, the source of all good, has revealed himself to the heathen in external and internal nature, (*ουκ αμαρτυρον ἑαυτον αφηκεν*, Acts 14:17. —*ου μακραν απο ἑνος ἑκαστου ἡμων ὑπαρχει*, Acts 17:27); still they have only obscure views and conjectures respecting a beneficent Creator of nature, and a righteous Judge; and these views need to be evolved by clear and distinct instructions, de-

[1] Ps. 19: 2—4.

[2] Acts 17: 26.

rived from God, through the medium of persons resident either amongst them or in their vicinity. Thus might the Athenians,[1] prior to the arrival of the apostle Paul, have sought instruction on religious subjects from the Jews, who under the dominion of the Romans, every where enjoyed religious liberty; and thus did they in fact partially receive it.[2] I here pass over the earlier migrations of the Jews, voluntary or forced, the wanderings of the ancient worshippers of God, and the more recent travels of christians, all of whom have had various intercourse with the heathen. See Köppen on the salutary influence which the Bible has had on the world, sup. cit. Pt. 2. p. 309 &c. (2d ed. p. 330 &c.) Baumgarten Crusius, "Scripture and reason for reflecting christians, Vol. I. p. 54 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

That all nature harmoniously tends to effect certain ends, and was purposely adapted to these ends by its Creator, is not a fact which is the subject of immediate observation; but it is a rational supposition, which we take for granted.[3]

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Compare the "Weinachtsprogramm" of 1788, on 1 Tim. 3: 16, p. 16.[4]

ILLUSTRATION 6.

It is evident, from the nature of the miracles of Jesus and his apostles (§ 8), and from the moral character of the doctrines which were established by them, that the cause from which they proceeded must have been a Being possessed not only of

---

1 Acts ch. 17. 2 Acts 17: 17.

3 See Kant's Critik der Urtheilskraft, § 75. p. 332.

4 See also John 11: 41. 14: 10. 10: 32, 37. 5: 17—30, 36. 17: 1—5. Acts 2: 32—36. And § 8. Illust. 2. § 10. Illust. 25—27.

very superior intelligence and power, but also of beneficence and love of virtue. Compare Flatt's "Contributions to the science of christian doctrines and practice," p. 38, 39, 43 &c.

§ 20.

God is the Creator and Ruler of the world.

The scriptural representation of God, whose existence has been proved (§ 17—19), is, that he is the Creator and Ruler of the world, Jer. 10:10—16, (v. 12, עֹשֵׂה אֶרֶץ בכוֹחוֹ מֵכִין תֵּבֵל בְּחָכְמָתוֹ וּבִתְבוּנָתוֹ נָטָה שָׁמָיִם who made the earth by his power, he founded the world by his wisdom, and by his intelligence he stretched out the heavens. v. 16, יוֹצֵר הַכֹּל הוּא he is the former of all things. Psalm 96 : 5. 146 : 6, עֹשֵׂה שָׁמַיִם וָאָרֶץ אֶת־הַיָּם וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בָּם he who made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them. Is. 42: 5. 44: 24. 45: 12, 18. 66: 2, Matth. 19: 4, *ὁ ποιησας * απ᾽ αρχης* the Creator, in the beginning. ch. 11: 25, *κυριος του ουρανου και της γης* Lord of heaven and of earth. Acts 14: 15, *θεος ζων, ὃς εποιησε τον ουρανον και την γην, και την θαλασσαν, και παντα τα εν αυτοις* the living God, who made the heaven and the earth, and the sea, and all things which are in them. Acts 17 : 24. Rom. 1 : 19, 20, 25. 11: 36, *εξ αυτου, και δι᾽ αυτου, και εις αυτον τα παντα* of him, and by him, and to him are all things. 1 Cor. 8: 5, 6, *εἱς θεος, εξ οὐ τα παντα* one God, from whom are all things: comp. Heb. 2 : 10. Rev. 4: 11, *συ εκτισας τα παντα, και δια το θελημα συ ησαν, και εκτισθησαν* thou didst create all things, and by thy will they were created. Rev. 10: 6. 14: 7.

ILLUSTRATION.

*In the parallel passage of Mark (10: 6), ὁ θεος *God*, is used instead of ὁ ποιησας the Creator or He who made. Lösner, in his Annotations on Matth. 19: 4, adduces a passage from Philo, (De Opificio mundi,) in which God is called ὁ ποιων, and others, in which he is termed ὁ γεννησας.

§ 21.

The power of God.

From the greatness of the universe, a part of which surrounds us, and of which we ourselves constitute a part, we infer the great power (1) of its invisible Author. Rom. 1 : 20. Jer. 27 : 5. 51: 15. Is. 40: 26. Ps. 147 : 5. Job 40 : 9. ch. 41. It is evident, that the power of God is able to produce effects in the universe (2), which the course of events and the agency of natural causes can never be expected to accomplish. For the course of events and the agency of natural causes, frequently fail to make happiness attendant on virtue in the life of individuals; and yet reason and conscience justify the expectation (3), that God will complete this harmony or coincidence of happiness and virtue, in the most perfect manner (4). The facts, by which this omnipotent influence of God on nature is proved, are the miracles recorded in Scripture; of which (5) we shall here adduce as evidence, (comp. § 19. Illustration 3) only those which were wrought in the life time of Jesus and in the period immediately subsequent.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Kant, in his "Critik der Urtheilskraft," (§ 91, 85. p. 469 &c. 395,) remarks, that the physico-theological proof, strictly considered, would indeed prove that the Author of nature is *very powerful*, but not that he is *omnipotent;* because our utmost knowledge of the world, is only a partial knowledge of the whole. Compare his "Critique on practical reason," p. 251.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Luke 1: 34—37, *ουκ αδυνατον παρα τῳ θεῳ παν ῥημα* nothing is impossible with God. Gen. 18:11—14, הֲיִפָּלֵא מֵיְהוָה דָּבָר is any thing impossible to Jehovah? Rom. 4: 18, 21, *ὁ επηγγελται*, (sc. *ὁ θεος*,) *δυνατος εστι και ποιησαι* he who promised, sc. God, is able also to perform. Zech. 8: 6.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

See Kant's "Kritik der Urtheilskraft," § 86. note. § 88. and § 17, 18 of this work.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

If this expectation does not necessarily suppose the *omnipotence* of God, and if we therefore cannot agree with Kant, "that the supreme Being must be supposed omnipotent, in order that he may adapt universal nature to the highest moral purposes;"[1] still it leads us to the idea, that the power of God is very great and transcends all our conceptions. Eph. 3: 20, *ὁ δυναμενος ὑπερ παντα ποιησαι ὑπερεκπερισσου η νοουμεν* he that is able to do abundantly more than we can comprehend. Ps. 145: 3. See Flatt's "Letters on the moral evidence of the existence of God," p. 74 &c.

1 "Critik der Urtheilskraft," § 86. p. 409. "Critique on practical reason," p. 252.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

These miracles are regarded in the New Testament, as proofs of the divine power. John 11: 4, 40, *δοξα του θεου* the glory of God.[1] Ephes. 1: 19, 20. Acts 10 : 38. Comp. Luke 9: 43. 5: 17. So also the miracles recorded in the Old Testament, Exod. 9: 16. 15: 6, 7, 11, 12. Deut. 11: 2 &c. Ps. 77: 14 &c. 135: 5, and especially v. 9. Köppen, in the work above quoted, Pt. I. p. 180 &c. (2d ed. p. 215), gives a general view of all the scriptural miracles, considered as revelations of the glory of God. The Scriptures combine the evidence of the divine power, which is derived from the two sources, the creation of the world, and the miracles. Ps. 136: 4 &c. Jer. 32: 17, 19, 20.

§ 22.

The intellectual character of God.

The incomprehensible (1) greatness of the divine intelligence, appears from the wise adaptation of the world to great and exalted ends (2) Psalm 104: 24. 147 : 4 &c. Is. 40 : 28, אֵין חֵקֶר לִתְבוּנָתוֹ his intelligence is incomprehensible. Prov. 3 : 19, 20. Jer. 51: 15. And as God is the Author of creation, he must be most perfectly acquainted with it (Is. 29: 16. Ps. 33: 15); and nothing, however minute (3) or recondite (4), can be unknown to him (5).

---

1 On this interpretation of *δοξα*, as denoting *power* (עוז), *miraculous power*; see Bolten's "Account given by John of Jesus the Messiah, in his Gospel, ch. 1: 14." and Kuinöl's Comment. in Evang. Johann. p. 113.

This we must necessarily admit (6), if our expectation be well founded (7): that he will hereafter execute the sentence which conscience pronounces upon us, (Rom. 2: 15, 16. comp. § 17.) For, how could he be a competent judge, if he had not the most minute acquaintance with the whole life of every individual, as well as with the state of his heart (8), and indeed with all the outward circumstances in which he was placed? For such knowledge is absolutely necessary, to form a correct estimate of the moral worth of any individual. The annunciation of a future judgment (comp. § 24. Illust. 8. § 17. No. 4) implies, that God has already determined what he will hereafter do. And it is evident from the constitution of the world (10), and from the predictions of future contingencies (12) which actually came to pass (11), that this foreknowledge of God (Acts 15: 18, *γνωστα απ' αιωνος εστι τω θεω παντα τα εργα αυτου* known unto God from the beginning of the world are all his works), is of the greatest extent, and that it embraces those plans of God, which presuppose that creatures will be in a *particular situation* and will pursue a *particular course of conduct* (9); it is therefore evident, that God has a perfect knowledge of future events in the natural world, and likewise of the free actions of his creatures (10). The prophecies above alluded to, are the accomplished predictions of Jesus; which he pronounced by virtue of his union with God, and not only in the narrow circle of his friends (13), but also in publick (14); so that even his enemies well recollected them (15).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The divine intelligence inscrutable.

Even in those things in which we can observe an adaptation of means to their ends, we are not able to discover *all* the means which the wisdom of God has used for the accomplishment of those excellent designs; and we are often unable to penetrate into the internal nature of objects, which we are compelled to regard with the highest admiration; nor can we, in all cases, discover the power by which ends are accomplished.[1] It therefore becomes us to be modest in our decisions,[2] and to confess that the knowledge and wisdom of God are beyond our comprehension.[3] It would be the height of folly, to pretend to a perfect knowledge of the inscrutable God,[4] and to admit of no divine mysteries;[5] but whenever we are not able to discover the benevolent designs of God in any thing, unhesitatingly to deny, that any can exist which are worthy of him. On the contrary, whenever the designs of God are inscrutable to us,[6] we ought still to believe, that he has designs of the most benevolent nature; because subsequent experience has so often shown this to be fact, in regard to former mysterious events.[7]

Kant remarks, that "we are not qualified to infer that the highest possible wisdom belongs to God, from the lessons of instruction afforded by an acquaintance with the world; because nothing short of omniscience, can determine, in reference to any given world with which we may become acquainted, whether

---

1 Job 38: 39. 2 Job 40: 1—5. 42, 1—6.

3 Is. 40: 13, 14, 28. 55: 8, 9. Rom. 11: 33. Ps. 139: 6.

4 Matth. 11: 27. 1 Cor. 2: 11. 5 1 Cor. 2: 10, 7. Eph. 3: 9.

6 Rom. 11: 33.

7 Compare § 18. Illust. 1. See Jacobi's "Reflections on the wisdom of God, as displayed in the constitution of human society, and in revelation," No. XII. § 19. Pt. II. p. 228. 3d edit.

its perfection is so great, that no greater could possibly have been displayed either in its creation or government."[1]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Vide Jacobi, sup. cit. No. I. § 2. Vol. I. p. 3. Psalm 104: 24. 147: 4. Is. 40: 28. Prov. 3: 19, 20. Jer. 51: 15.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Matth. 10: 29, 30, *ὑμων και αἱ τριχες της κεφαλης πασαι ηριθμημεναι εισι* and all the hairs of your head are numbered. Ps. 56: 9.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Ps. 139: 7—16. Is. 29: 15. Jer. 16: 17, 23, 24. Matth. 6: 4, 6, 8. Ps. 10: 14, 17. 38: 10. Dan. 2: 22.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

1 John 3: 20, *μειζων εστι ὁ θεος της καρδιας ἡμων, και γινωσκει παντα*[2] God is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things. Heb. 4: 13.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Kant, in his "Critik der Urtheilskraft," § 86, says: "We are obliged, in reference to the highest possible good (the harmony or connexion of happiness and virtue in rational beings) which can be attained under the divine government, to look upon God as omniscient; in order that he may not be unacquainted with the inmost thoughts and dispositions of his creatures, which constitute the true moral character of their actions." Also in his "Critique on practical reason," (p. 252,) he says, "God must be omniscient, in order to have a perfect knowledge of my inmost thoughts and secret disposition, in all possible cases, and through all futurity."

1 Uber das Mislingen aller philosophischen Versuche in der Theodicee, Berliner Monatschrift, September, 1791, S. 213 &c.

2 See Morus, in tres Johann. epistolas; where he refutes the version, "God's heart is more disposed to forgive."

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Ps. 7: 9, 10. Jer. 17: 10. Prov. 24 : 12. Matth. 6: 4, 6. 1 Cor. 4 : 5. All these passages contain the position, "that God rewards and punishes, according to his most perfect knowledge of the human heart."

ILLUSTRATION 8.

Ps. 139: 1—12. Luke 16: 15. Acts 1: 24. Rom. 8: 27. God has the most perfect acquaintance with the human heart and life, *καρδιογνωστης—ὁ ερευνων τας καρδιας·* comp. 1 John 3: 20.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

1 Pet. 1: 20. 1 Cor. 2 : 7. 2 Tim. 1: 9. Eph. 1 : 4 &c. The plan of God for the salvation of mankind through Jesus, and which, according to the texts quoted, he formed from eternity; presupposes a foreknowledge of the free actions and of the whole condition of the human family. Therefore, God must, as Jacobi remarks,[1] have foreseen the fall of the human race. Compare Rev. 17 : 8, *ὠν ου γεγραπται τα ονοματα απο καταβολης του κοσμου* whose names are not recorded from eternity, in the book of life; comp. Rev. 13: 8.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

Ps. 139: 2, 16. Jer. 1: 5. Gal. 1: 15. comp. Acts 26: 19. God had appointed the apostle Paul, from his birth, to be an apostle of the gentiles; because he foresaw that he would obey the heavenly call, *ουκ απειθης εγενομην τῃ ουρανιῳ οπτασιᾳ* I did not disobey the heavenly vision.

Therefore, God possesses the most perfect knowledge, not only of himself [scientia Dei necessaria vel naturalis], Matth.

1 Sup. cit. No. VII. § 22. Vol. I. p. 311.

11 : 27. 1 Cor. 2 : 10, 11, and of every thing which actually exists or has existed; but also of all things possible, whether they are such as shall hereafter occur, or whether they shall never have actual existence. See § 30. Illust. 10.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Vide Jacobi sup. cit. No. XII. § 13—18. Vol. 2. p. 209 &c. where the author adduces several cases, in which the provisions of nature coincide, in the most perfect manner, with contingent occurrences; for example, the relative proportion in the number of both sexes of the human family.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

The divine attribute which is commonly termed foreknowledge or prescience, is described as something peculiar to the supreme God, in the following passages: Is. 41: 22 &c. 42: 8, 9. 43: 8, 9 &c. 44: 6 &c. 45: 19 &c. 46: 9 &c. 48: 3 &c. Hess, (in his "Bibliothek of sacred history," Vol. II. p. 223, where he adduces these passages,) remarks: "Isaiah undoubtedly sets the declarations of the God of Israel, as genuine and true, and as authenticated by actual fulfilment, in contrast with the lying oracles of the heathen, when he calls upon the pagan gods to prove their truth and their prescience of events, in the manner the God of Israel did."

Other proofs of the divine prescience, collected chiefly from the Old Testament, are adduced by Köppen, in the work sup. cit. Vol. I. p. 210 &c. (2d ed. p. 300 &c.) Compare also Michaelis' Dogmatik, § 12.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

To his disciples Jesus predicted the destruction of Jerusalem,[1]

1 The prophetic character of this prophecy, is vindicated by Ewald, in his work entitled, "The religious doctrines of the Bible, considered in reference to our spiritual necessities," Vol. II, Stuttgard and Tübingen, 1812, p. 279 &c. See also Flatt's Dissertation, "Observv. ad Matth. ch. 24, 25, Tübingen, 1811, Note 17. p. 17.

Mark 13 : 3 &c.; his death and resurrection,[1] Matth. 20 : 17—19; the denial of Peter, Matth. 26 : 34; and in Mark 11: 1—6, he informed them, that they would find an ass' colt tied, and would obtain it without difficulty. In like manner, he predicted that they would meet a man carrying a pitcher, and that he would be their guide to the house where the passover was to be prepared for him, Mark 14: 13—16.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 14.

Jesus announced to a large multitude the destruction of Jerusalem, (Luke 18 : 41 &c. Comp. Matth. 22 : 7 with 21 : 46.) Thus also he declared before the chief priests and elders of the people, that the Jews would, by their own fault, be excluded from the christian church, and the Heathen be admitted into it, (Matth. 21: 43. comp. v. 23.) He foretold the ill treatment which the heralds of the Gospel would receive from the Jews, and the consequences of it (Matth. 23: 34 &c.); the treatment which he should himself meet with from the Jews (Matth. 21: 37); his own execution (Luke 13: 33) (in the presence of the Pharisees, v. 31); his death and resurrection (John 2 : 19—

---

1 On the prophecies of Jesus relative to his death and resurrection, the reader may consult, in addition to the works referred to above (§ 8. Illust. 6), Ewald ubi supra, p. 270 &c. and the Magazine for christian doctrines and practice, No. 12. p. 1—14. and Flatt's Symbb. ad illustranda graviora quaedam Jesu dicta in Evangelio Johanneo, Tübing. 1807, Vol. I. p. 1—14. Also Hess' work entitled, Lehre Thaten und Schicksale Jesu," new ed. Zurich, 1806, 2d part, p. 472—499.

2 If we adopt the opinions of other interpreters (Gabler, Paulus, Kuinöl, and Stolz), that Jesus had previously planned all this with the householder, in order that Judas might not too soon find out the place where he intended to keep the Passover, and lay hold of him at the time of it; this narrative will then prove, that Jesus was perfectly acquainted, beforehand, with the measures taken by his enemies, and particularly by Judas who betrayed him. See Hess' Lebensgeschichte Jesu, Band II. S. 317. "Jesus had a particular person in view, whom he did not wish to mention at that time; but he availed himself of this opportunity to demonstrate to his disciples, how perfectly he was acquainted with the issue which his affairs would take."

22) — (before the Jews who were assembled in the temple, v. 14); and his death and the subsequent propagation of his doctrines among other nations (John 10: 11—18).

ILLUSTRATION 15.

Acts 6: 14. Matth. 27: 63 &c, 40. 26: 61. Flatt's Magazine. and Hess, sup. cit. p. 816.

§ 23.

The goodness of God.

Of the fact, that God is good to all his creatures (1), especially to his rational creatures (2), for the sake of whose moral nature the world was created (§ 18. Illust. 7), we may easily be convinced, if with a calm and candid mind, we lay ourselves open to those impressions and feelings which the contemplation of nature (3) awakens in us; and especially, as it is natural for us to expect, that the Being who implanted parental love in our bosoms, would himself entertain love for his creatures (4). Nor ought this conviction to be shaken by those frequent incidents of adversity which we meet with in life. For, experience teaches that they often pave the way to important blessings (5). They tend to this most important result, being only more vigorous means of education, which are perfectly consistent (6) with the paternal love of God. They enable us to make greater advances in spiritual improvement (7) and moral excellence, and they inspire us with greater reverence (8) for that moral

Governor, whom, according to the dictates of our nature, we are bound to obey, but whom in prosperity we are prone to forget (9). And thus they make us more tranquil in this life, and more happy in the world to come (10). It is indeed true, that those who submit entirely to the providence of God (11), are sometimes overtaken by afflictions, the advantage of which they are not able immediately to discover. But our heavenly Father, whose intelligence far surpasses our conceptions (§ 22. Illust. 1), can discover advantages in adversity (Heb. 12: 9, 10), which are concealed from the view of his children (12), and which shall yet be enjoyed (13) at some future period (14).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Psalm 145: 9. 104: 31, 10—14, 16—22, 25, 27 &c. 136: 25. 147: 8 &c. Luke 12: 24, 6.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Luke 12: 7, 24. Matth. 6: 26, 30.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Ps. 136: 5—9. 104: 1—24. Jer. 5: 24. Acts 14: 17. 17: 25, 28, *διδους πασι ζωην και πνοην και παντα* giveth to all, life and breath and all things. 1 Tim. 4: 3 &c. 6: 17, *θεος παρεχων ἡμιν παντα πλουσιως εις απολαυσιν* God giveth us richly all things for our enjoyment.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Matth. 7: 9—11. Ps. 103: 13, כְּרַחֵם אָב עַל־בָּנִים רִחַם יְהוָה עַל־יְרֵאָיו as a father pitieth his children, Jehovah pities them that fear him. Is. 49: 15. Luke 15: 11 &c. In the parable of the lost son, the character of Jesus as a merciful God, is represented by the disposition of a father toward his disobe-

dient child. On the different modifications of the divine love, and its different names, (grace, mercy, patience, longsuffering,) see Schott's Epitome theol. christ. dog. p. 47.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Gen. 45 : 5—13. 50 : 20. In the latter passage, Joseph says to his brethren, אַתֶּם חֲשַׁבְתֶּם עָלַי רָעָה אֱלֹהִים חֲשָׁבָהּ לְטֹבָה you designed evil against me, but God meant it for good.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Prov. 3: 12. comp. Heb. 12: 5—9, *ὁν αγαπᾳ κυριος, παιδευει* whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Rom. 5 : 3 &c. Heb. 12 : 10, 11, *πασα παιδεια—ὑστερον δε καρπον ειρηνικον τοις δι' αυτης γεγυμνασμενοις αποδιδωσι δικαιοσυνης* all chastisement—afterwards it produces the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who are exercised by it.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

Is. 26: 16, יְהוָה בַּצַּר פָּקְדוּךָ Jehovah! in distress they look around for thee.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Luke 8: 14, *ὑπο—πλουτου και ἡδονων του βιου συμπνιγονται.*

ILLUSTRATION 10.

Rom. 2: 14, 15, 16, 6—10.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Persons who disregarded the intimations and chastisements of divine Providence, are described in Rom. 2 : 4 &c. Amos 4: 6 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

2 Cor. 4: 17, 18, *μη σκοπουντων ἡμων τα βλεπομενα, αλλα τα μη βλεπομενα* we do not look only at the things which are

seen in this world, but at those which are as yet invisible. Rom. 8: 24.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

The divine permission of moral evil, is discussed in § 39. Illust. 4; it is the permission of *natural* evil alone which is spoken of here.

ILLUSTRATION 14.

Rom. 8: 17—23. Col. 3: 3 &c. 2 Thess. 1: 4—10. The benefit of such afflictions, will be brought to light only in the future world. Matth. 5 : 12, *ὁ μισθος ὑμων πολυς εν τοις ουρανοις* great is your reward in heaven.

§ 24.

The justice and holiness of God.

Even the love of God induces him to avenge the injury which the members of the human family, who are all equally dear to him, inflict on each other (1). His love (2) urges him to support the dignity of those laws, which the same love had prompted him to give to men because his wisdom pronounced them salutary (3). The voice of conscience, and that belief of a future retribution which is so deeply founded in the constitution of our moral nature (Rom. 2:14, 15. 1: 32. § 16), prove to us, that our conduct has the most important influence on our happiness (4); that God, on whom we are dependant, distributes (5) with the most perfect impartiality (6), happiness to the virtuous (7) and misery to the vicious (8); and that the measure of

his rewards and punishments, is exactly proportionate to the degree of our faithfulness or unfaithfulness (9). In reference to this twofold judicial (10) act of God, we ascribe to him *justice* (11); and we infer from this attribute (12), that he, whose earnest wish it is that we should be holy, must himself be the archetype of *holiness* (13); or, that he himself loves that moral excellence which he endeavours to promote by his promises and rewards, and hates that evil which he endeavours to prevent by his menaces and punishments (14).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

2 Thess. 1: 6, 7. 1 Pet. 2 : 23. Psalm 10. Luke 18 : 7, *ὁ δε θεος ου μη ποιησει εκδικησιν των εκλεκτων αὐτου των βοωντων προς αυτον ἡμερας και νυκτος ;—λεγω ὑμιν ὁτι ποιησει εν ταχει* and will not God avenge his elect who cry unto him day and night? — I say unto you, he will shortly avenge them. Matth. 18: 32 &c. comp. Michaelis on "the Scripture doctrine relative to sin and the atonement." § 6, 8. 2d edit.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Compare Michaelis above referred to, § 8. p. 40 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Is. 48: 17, 18. Ps. 119: 144. Rom. 7: 12, *ἡ εντολη—αγαθη* the commandment is good. 8: 6 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Mal. 3 : 13—18. Gen. 18 : 25. "There is a difference between the destiny of the good and the wicked."

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Rom. 2 : 6—10. 2 Cor. 5 : 10. (compare Heb. 10 : 38.) These three passages speak of the future righteous judgment of

God. Although, in the present life, happiness and misery frequently appear not to be proportionate to the moral worth of men (Ps. 37. 73: 3 &c.); yet it by no means follows, that we are deceived by the opinion, so deeply rooted in our moral nature, that the destiny of every individual shall be according to his moral worth. For we often behold a reversion in the lot of men (Ps. 37: 35 &c.); and where this is not the case, a mind that reflects and is susceptible of moral feelings, if unable to account for the prosperity of vice or the suffering of virtue, will naturally be led to the anticipation of a future retribution from God (2 Thess. 1: 5—7).[1] But we can discover some reasons, why, on the one hand, the children of God, always imperfect, should not while in this world, in this nursery for heaven, be exempted from all the grievances attendant on a state of probation (§ 23); and why, on the other hand, God should not instantaneously annihilate the wicked, whom he wishes to gain by his goodness, and some of whom he foresees will actually reform. Nay, this forbearance of God toward the wicked, may, in various ways, be beneficial to those who are more virtuous; for they sustain various relations to them, and also themselves stand in need of similar forbearance, on account of their own sins and their slow progress in virtue.

Jacobi adduces several reasons to account for God's not always punishing the wicked in the present world, or not instantaneously annihilating them; see his work "On the wise purposes of God, &c." No. XIII. § 30—40. Pt. III. p. 51 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Rom, 2: 11, *ουκ εστι προσωπολημψια παρα τω θεω* there is no respect of persons with God. 1 Pet. 1: 17. Col. 3: 25. 4: 1. Eph. 6: 8, 9.

---

[1] Compare the Dissert. (in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. 3. p. 121—125); "A vindication of the Mosaic religion."

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Rom. 2: 13. 10: 5. Gal. 3: 12, *ὁ ποιησας αυτα* (sc. *τα του νομου*), *ζησεται εν αυτοις* he that doth these things, viz. the things of the law, shall live in them. Eph. 6: 8. Matth. 19: 17. comp. Heb. 11: 6, *ὁ θεος τοις εκζητουσιν αυτον, μισθοποδοτης γινεται* God is a rewarder of them that seek him.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

Mal. 2: 17. Rom. 1: 18. 2: 2 &c.,12. Col. 3 : 25, *ὁ αδικων κομιειται, ὁ ηδικησε* he that doeth wrong, shall receive what he hath done amiss. Heb. 10 : 29—31. 12 : 29, *ὁ θεος ἡμων πυρ καταναλισκων* our God is a consuming fire. Although the punishments of God (Luke 21: 23. comp. v. 22, and Rom. 2: 5), and likewise his punitive justice, are called the *wrath* of God (*οργη*), and are represented by figures of a terrific nature ; yet the writers of the Bible, and in particular the writers of the Old Testament, were well acquainted with the divine goodness and grace. See Ex. 34 : 6, יְהוָה אֵל רַחוּם וְחַנּוּן אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם וְרַב־חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת Jehovah God, merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in grace and truth. Deut. 4: 31. Ps. 145: 8. 103: 8—14. 130: 4 &c. עִמְּךָ הַסְּלִיחָה forgiveness with thee. Joel 2 : 13. Lam. 3 : 33. And as they knew that God is not angry after the manner of men (Hos. 11: 9. comp. § 26. Illust. 5), it is therefore reasonable, that no philosopher should denounce their anthropopathic expressions ; and the more so, since even the purest expressions which are applied to God, to his attributes and actions, are always anthropopathic. Relative to *οργη* as applied to God, Kypke (on Rom. 2: 5) says, " *οργη* non iram divinam, neque etiam qualescunpue hujus irae effectus, sed poenam designat, quam Deus ut justus Judex infligit ;" *οργη* does not signify the divine wrath, neither does it denote the various effects of this anger ; but it designates the *punish-*

ment which God as a just Judge, inflicts." He adduces passages from Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Dionysius Halicarn. in which *οργη* signifies punishment, and a few in which it denotes punishment inflicted by law. In the passage Rom. 2 : 5, *οργη* is explained by *αποκαλυψις της δικαιοκρισιας* manifestation of the punitive justice of God. Comp. Heb. 3: 11, and Johan. van Voorst, "On the divine punishments," in the publication of the Society at the Hague for the defence of the christian religion, 1794, p. 56 &c. Compare also Schleusner's Lex. art. *οργη* No. 3.

See Jacobi's "Dissertations on important points in religion," No. X. vol. II. p. 87 &c. Kant's "Critik der Urtheilskraft," § 88. p. 430 &c. Prolegomena, p. 276 &c. "Critik der practischen Vernunft," p. 276 &c. (Compare with this, Flatt's "Observv. ad comparandam Kantianam disciplinam cum Christiana doctrina pertinentes," § VI.) Fichte's "Versuch einer Critik aller Offenbarung," p. 127. (2d ed. p. 189 &c.) Tieftrunk's "Censur des Protestantischen Lehrbegriffs," Pt. III. Introd. "On symbolic knowledge in reference to religion." Comp. "Letters on Kant's, Fichte's, and Forberg's Theory of religion," in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. V. p. 217 &c. See also Jacobi, "Von den göttlichen Dingen," p. 182. comp. with Weisz, "On the living God," p. 23 &c. 220 &c. and Ewald's "Religious doctrines of the Bible," Vol. I. p. 6, 79. All these writings refer to the symbolic knowledge of God, or the knowledge of God according to analogy, and on the anthropopathic designations of the attributes and actions of God, which are founded on this kind of knowledge. Our knowledge of God is analogical (symbolic) or anthopomorphic, so far as we consider the divine Being, his attributes and actions, as resembling the actions and attributes of men; for we do not know what God in himself is, nor how he acts. Compare Reinhard's Dogmatic, p. 93.

Here may be mentioned the threefold method (stated by Sartorius) of arriving at a knowledge of God, via negationis, via eminentiae, via causalitatis. Vide Sartorii Compend. p. 79. and compare Reinhard's Dogmatik, p. 92. Fichte, in his well known Dissertation, "on the ground of our knowledge of God" (p. 16 &c.), objects, that "this symbolic knowledge of God, is contradictory; because we represent to ourselves an infinite being, by predicates which belong only to limited and finite beings." Compare what is said in refutation of this, in the "Letters on Fichte's theory of religion," in Flatt's Magazine, Pt. 6. p. 206 &c. Pt. 5. p. 229 &c. And here it may not be improper to quote from Brastberger's treatise, "On the ground of our belief in God" (1802), a passage (p. 104—107) containing the result of his reasoning: "It is true, the attributes which I ascribe to God, are properties which I find in myself; only they are conceived apart from those limitations and particular determinations which they have and must have in me. It is true, that the removal of these limitations and particular determinations, leaves me only general conceptions, which can never have an actual existence. And it is further true, that as soon as we wish to determine those indefinite conceptions or properties, we are compelled to ascribe to God, finite and limited attributes. But notwithstanding this, our knowledge of God, is neither vain nor contradictory. For, when I ascribe to him human attributes, such as understanding and will, with the removal of the particular determinations of our finite understanding and will; my idea amounts to this: 'if I possessed the faculty of knowing God *immediately*, I should find in him only such properties, as could and would effect every thing which my faculties would effect, if they could ever be divested of limits and extended to infinity. This knowledge of God, is by no means so definite and perfect as I could wish; yet it is perfectly adequate

for that purpose for which, in general, faith in God is necessary to me.'"

On the false and injurious anthropomorphism, see Reinhard's System of christian ethics, Pt. I. § 120. and on the different meanings of anthropomorphic and anthropopathic, see § 108. No. 2; as also Schott's epitom. theol. christ. dogmat. p. 36. and Schmidt's Christliche Religionslehre, S. 45.

On the use of anthropomorphism in religious instruction, see Niemeyer's "Letters to christian ministers," 2d Collect. Letter 10. and Teller's New Magazine for clergymen, Vol. II. 2d part.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Luke 19 : 16—19, 24—26. 2 Cor. 9 : 6. Matth. 11: 22, 24. Luke 47 : 48. All these passages contain this position: the measure of future happines or misery, will differ, according to the obedience or disobedience of different persons.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

2 Tim. 4: 8, *αποκειται μοι ὁ της δικαιοσυνης στεφανος, ὁν αποδωσει μοι—ὁ δικαιος κριτης* a crown of righteousness is laid up for me, which the righteous Judge will give me. Compare Dissert. de sensu vocis *δικαιος*, Note 9. Ps. 7 : 12. Rev. 16: 5—7. 19 : 2, *αληθιναι και δικαιαι αἱ κρισεις αυτου* true and righteous are his judgments.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Ps. 7: 10, 18. 2 Thess. 1: 5—7. Rom. 2: 5, 6, *δικαιοκρισια του θεου, ὁς αποδωσει ἑκαστῳ κατα τα εργα αυτου* the just judgment of God, who will render to every one according to his works. Acts 17: 31.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

Ps. 5: 4—6, לֹא אֵל חָפֵץ רֶשַׁע thou art not a God who delighteth in wickedness. Rev. 15: 3.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

1 Pet. 1 : 16 &c. *ἁγιοι γενεσθε, ὁτι εγω ἁγιος ειμι* be ye holy, for I am holy. Eph. 4: 24. Matth. 5: 45, 48, *εσεσθε τελειοι ὡςπερ ὁ πατηρ ὑμων ὁ εν τοις ουρανοις τελειος εστι* be ye therefore perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect. 2 Pet. 1: 4.

ILLUSTRATION 14.

1 John 1: 5, *θεος φως εστι, και σκοτια ουκ εστι εν αυτῳ ουδεμια* God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. Deut. 32: 4. James 1: 13.

§ 25.

The spirituality of God.

As every rational and moral power, is termed a spirit; so God is a Spirit, John 4: 24 (1). And he regards not the external service of his worshippers, but the uprightness and sincerity of their minds (*πνευμα και αληθειαν*), v. 23 : 24. And man can resemble God (2), only by the excellence and perfection of his spirit, or mind; and not in his corporeal properties and actions, for these cannot in any measure belong to God (3).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

John 4: 24, *πνευμα ὁ θεος· και τους προσκυνουντας αυτον, εν πνευματι και αληθειᾳ δει προσκυνειν* God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.—*Πνευματι και αληθειᾳ* is a hendiadys,[1] for *πνευματι αληθινῳ*,

[1 Hendiadys, is a figure of speech, used by grammarians to designate that mode of expression which consists of two substantives joined together by the conjunction *and*, and put in the same case; whereas, according to

or, as it is expressed in Heb. 10 : 22, *εν αληθινῃ καρδιᾳ* with an upright heart. Similar examples may be seen in the Dissert. de sensu vocis *πληρωμα*, Note 60. Opuscul. Acad. Vol. I. p. 174 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Col. 3:10, *ενδυσαμενοι τον νεον (ανθρωπον), τον ανακαινουμενον—κατ' εικονα του κτισαντος αυτον* have put on the new man, who is renewed according to the image of his Creator. Luke 6: 35 &c. comp. § 24.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Rom. 1 : 23. Ex. 20 : 4, "Thou shalt not make any image of God."[1] 1 Tim. 6: 16, *ὀν ειδεν ουδεις ανθρωπων, ουδε ιδειν δυναται* whom no man hath seen or can see. 1: 17, *αφθαρτος—αορατος θεος* incorruptible—invisible God.

§ 26.

The veracity of God.

The vast intelligence, power, goodness, and holiness of God, require (1), that we should place unlimited confidence in him; and particularly, that we should regard his declarations as perfectly to be depended on (2). For he who is not willing to repose implicit confidence in God (1 John 5 : 10), must either be so foolish, as to believe that whatever is concealed from himself must be unknown to God also, or he must distrust him who is the arche-

the sense, one of these substantives should be an adjective qualifying the other, or a genitive following it. Thus in Hebrew, חֲלִיפוֹת וְצָבָא עִמִּי changes and a host are against me, i. e. changes of hosts, or hosts constantly receiving new supplies, Job 10: 17. S.]

[1] Stäudlin observes (Elements of Dogmatics, 2d ed. p. 199) : "It deserves notice, that God, though represented under the strongest anthropopathic expressions, would not be worshipped by any image."

type of holiness (3); or, forgetful of the providence and power of God (4), he must apprehend, that God may become involved in difficulties, and have occasion to revoke his purposes; — a supposition derogatory to the divine dignity (5), and applicable only to weak and changeable man. Even the idea of a future retribution, which leads us to believe the existence of a God (§ 18), leads us also to believe him a God of veracity (6) and immutability (7), a God in whom implicit confidence (8) may be reposed. And that anticipation would itself be unwarranted, and might prove delusive; if we could suppose it possible for God to deceive us, or to awaken in us an expectation which he either would not or could not fulfil; or if we could admit, that the God who formed a moral plan to which he adapted the structure of our moral nature, and which he has announced to us by our conscience (§ 17, 18), *could* be unstable and changeable, that he could abandon the plan which he had adopted, and suffer the expectations of our moral nature to remain unaccomplished. We assume as infallible, whatever the constitution of our nature, or God the Author of our nature, teaches us. Nay, the principles of human knowledge generally, would become uncertain (9), if, as Des Cartes expresses it, God had so framed our nature, that we should mistake delusions for the plainest and clearest truths. If, therefore, we would not be universal sceptics, and doubt of every thing; we must admit (10), that the Author of our nature, is a God of truth, and deserves our implicit confidence.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Is. 40: 12—31. Ps. 146 : 5 &c. 18 : 31 &c. 118 : 1—9. In these passages, confidence in God is founded on the divine goodness, power, and wisdom.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Ps. 33: 4, יָשָׁר דְּבַר־יְהוָה the word of Jehovah is true. John 3: 33.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

2 Cor. 1:18,19, *πιστος ὁ θεος, ὁτι ὁ λογος ἡμων ὁ προς ὑμας ουκ εγενετο ν αι ϰαι ο υ*, "My doctrine among you, the author of which is the God of truth, was not mutable and unstable." Comp. Notitt. histor. Epist. ad Corinth. interpret. servientes, p. 101 &c. in Opusc. Acad. Vol. 1. p. 360 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Is. 46: 10 &c. Rom. 4: 21, "He who hath promised, is able also to fulfil."

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Rom. 3: 4, *γενεσθω θεος αληθης, πας δε ανθρωπος ψευστης* let God be true, but every man a liar. 1 Sam. 15: 29, "The unchangeable God of Israel does not deceive, or repent of any thing; for he is not a man, that he could repent." When, therefore, we read in the 11th verse of this same chapter, that God repented of his having made Saul king, we must not suppose that he repented as man does. Neither did Moses intend to ascribe human repentance to God, Gen. 6: 6; for he well knew, that God is not a man that he should lie or repent. It therefore follows, that the anthropopathic expression *repentance*, like that of *anger* (§ 24. Illust. 7), has a sense which is not unworthy of God;—it imports, that according to the immutable plan of God, persons who have reformed, are not treated in the same manner as before their reformation. Comp. Joel 2: 14, with v. 12, 13.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

John 3: 33, *θεος αληθης εστι* God is true. Tit. 1: 2, *ὁ ἀψευδης θεος* God who lieth not. 2 Tim. 2: 13, *ει απιστουμεν, εκει-*

νος πιστος μενει if we do not believe, he remaineth faithful. Heb. 6: 18, αδυνατον ψευδεσθαι θεον it is impossible for God to lie.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Ex. 3: 14—17, אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה I am that I am. 6: 2—8, אֲנִי יְהוָה I am Jehovah. Deut. 7: 8 &c. Mal. 3: 6, אֲנִי יְהוָה לֹא שָׁנִיתִי I am Jehovah, I do not change. Rom. 11: 29 αμεταμελητα τα χαρισματα και ἡ κλησις του θεου God will not repent of his gifts and calling. Heb. 6: 17, το αμεταθετον της βουλης θεου the immutability of the counsel of God. James 1: 17, παρα θεῳ ουκ ενι καταλλαγη η τροπης αποσκιασμα with God there is no variableness or shadow of turning.

Michaelis remarks, on Ex. 3: 14—17, quoted in this illustration: that by the name אֶהְיֶה, as well as by that of יְהוָה, God represents himself as unchangeable, (particularly in his promises, his friendships and love,) as a being who will remain the same for ever. Comp. also Dathè, on Ex. 6: 3.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

1 Thess. 5: 24. 1 Cor. 1: 9. Heb. 10: 23.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Compare Flatt's Detached contributions for the determination and deduction of the idea and the principle of causality, p. 122 &c. and Michaelis, Dogmatik, p. 164.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

"The veracity of God is as important to the Deist, as to the believer in revealed religion. For, if it were in itself possible, and God felt disposed, he might deceive us in nature, by producing a constant confusion and contradiction of things, and by making reason mislead us; as truly as he could in the Scriptures." Allgemeine Litteratur Zeitung, for 1792, p. 137.

§ 27.

Inference drawn from the veracity of God, in favour of the truth of Scripture.

If there be, (as has been proved § 17—19,) a God to whom veracity belongs (§ 26); then we may receive, with perfect security, the declarations of the Holy Scriptures; which were either produced by God, and under his influence (§ 6, 9, 10, 11, 13), or at least were sanctioned by him (§ 9, 12, 13); and therefore have divine authority (§ 11—13). We may of course use them, in the discussion of all doctrines in general, and of that concerning the divine attributes in particular, not only to elucidate the dictates of our reason, or to prove the coincidence* of Scripture with those dictates, but in order to derive from them direct and solid arguments or evidence in support of doctrines of which they treat.

ILLUSTRATION.

* The beautiful coincidence of the doctrines of the Bible concerning God, with the established conclusions of reason, as appears from a comparison of the Scriptures with the religious opinions of those philosophers [1] who could not have drawn any thing from the sacred volume; should at least inspire us with respect for this volume, the superior excellence of whose instructions so far surpasses those of all other ancient writings. It ought to induce us to read without prejudice, and to estimate without partiality, all that they contain concerning a particular dispensation of God; and especially, as the superiority of the holy Scriptures over all other writings of antiquity, so well ac-

---

1 See Jacobi's "Dissertations on important religious subjects," No. XV, XVI.

cords with the assumption, that the knowledge of God, was in an extraordinary manner, made plainer to the sacred penmen than to any other persons. Compare the Dissertation entitled, "The natural views of God given in the Scriptures, compared with the revealed views of the divine Being."[1]

Ewald, in his "Religionslehren der Bibel,"[2] remarks: "The pretended revelations of other ancient nations, are not at all calculated to satisfy the spiritual necessities of well informed persons, who are acquainted with themselves. To many of these necessities, they have no reference at all.—They cannot, in the view of reason, assume an authenticated character; as well because they contain much that is manifestly fabulous, and of human invention; as because they are destitute of the positive evidences of a divine origin."—"The writings which the christian regards as a divine revelation, even independently of their divinity, contain much interesting matter, calculated to enlighten the understanding, and improve the heart; they contain an elevated and dignified Theodicea. In no other religion was every thing connected so closely with God, with *one God*, as in the Jewish; in no other was holiness so made the object and aim of every thing.—No other religion ever exhibited such striking, such undeniable proof of the supernatural agency of God; none ever combined so closely morality with religion." — "And the most refined and enlightened person, however numerous and various his necessities, never fails to find in christianity, what is necessary to meet all his wants. — And all this he can find no where else."

1 In Hess' Bibliothek of sacred history, Vol. II. p. 113 &c.

2 Theil I. S. 65, 67, 232—235. and Theil II. S. 197—200.

§ 28.

The unity of God.

We can discover no reason for believing in the existence of more than one God. For, when we contemplate (1) the works of nature, we find that, so far as our observation extends, they stand in such intimate connexion with each other, that their dependance on one Creator and Lord becomes highly probable (2); or if we reason from the idea of a moral government of the world, we cannot conceive how it can be divided among a multitude of regents; unless we admit that among these regents, so arbitrarily supposed, there is a perfect unity of purposes, and of manner of accomplishing them (3). But in a matter of such importance, one which has so great an influence on our exclusive reverence and respect for God (Deut. 6: 5. Mark 12: 30), we ought to regard the testimony of God himself as of the greater consequence; because thereby our belief (4) of the divine unity, is so confirmed (5), that we may now, with perfect certainty, affirm that there is but one God. For, if the Creator and Lord of nature had been produced by another being on whom he is dependent, or if he formed and governed this world in conjunction with another being; he would certainly, as his knowledge is so extensive, know something of such a being. But he knows of none who existed before him, or was his superior, or who cooperated with him in the work of creation (6). Jehovah, the God of the Israelites, is the only Jehovah (Deut. 6: 4. Mark 12: 29); that is, Jehovah, the Creator and Lord of nature, is the only Being to whom the name Jehovah belongs (7): he cannot possess the adorable and glorious

perfections (תִּהְלָּה כָּבוֹד) indicated by the name Jehovah, in common with any other being (Is. 42: 8); beside God (the only Governor *μονῳ δυναστῃ*) there is no governor; for all others are subject to him *τῳ κυριῳ των κυριευοντων* 1 Tim. 6: 15. No one, however distinguished he may be for wisdom, is wise, in comparison with "the only wise" (*μονῳ σοφῳ* Rom. 16: 27). Compared with God, there is no one good, *ουδεις αγαθος, ει μη εἱς, ὁ θεος* Mark 10: 18 (8). The excellences of every other being, compared with those of God, are as nothing; much less can any being surpass or equal God in divine attributes.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

"Every thing in nature proves the unity of its own adaptation, the unity of its object, and the unity of the means appointed for that object. There is nothing which can justify the idea of different systems, objects, and means. And beyond this, reason cannot carry the proof of the *unity* of God." Platner's Aphorisms, Pt. I, § 1143. edit. of 1784. (in the edit. of 1793, § 959). Compare Michaelis' Dogmatik, § 41. p. 176.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

It has been seen above (§ 18. Illust. 1. § 23, 24. Illust. 8), that when the attributes of God have been proved, even those things which appear to be at variance with these attributes, may be made to harmonize with them.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

See Flatt's Letters, "Uber den moralischen Erkenntnitzgrund in der Religion," (p. 76.) "The perfect harmony between morality and happiness, does not indeed prove an absolute numerical unity in the Author of the world; but it does prove a perfect unity of design."

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Jacobi [1] says, "No one has yet proved, that it is impossible that *several* necessary and eternal beings should possess creative power, and should have produced and governed this world in common." But whatever want of evidence may attend the supposition which reason makes: that there is only *one God;* it cannot be perfectly supplied in any other manner, than by the declarations of God himself. Hence it is not strange, that the unity of God should be entirely denied, or at least greatly adulterated,[2] by those nations which had not even a traditional knowledge of divine revelation.[3]

Kant, in his work entitled, "Religion within the limits of mere reason," (p. 179,) asserts that the doctrine of the unity of God, was not so very important a superiority of the Jewish religion over the religions of other nations. In refutation of this assertion, it is remarked, in the dissertation in Flatt's Magazine (Pt. 3. p. 131 &c., entitled, "An apology for the Mosaic Religion,") that the religious history of the polytheistic nations, most clearly proves the contrary to be true. "Polytheism" (Ewald justly remarks) "has a necessary and unavoidable tendency to lead the human mind into other errors; as is clearly evinced by the history of man. The idea of deity, wherever it was not raised to monotheism, always became more and more gross. One deity was conceived as differing from another; and consequently they were not *all* viewed as perfect patterns of every moral and other excellence; some were necessarily represented as lacking in morality and perfection; in short, the idea of God, was depressed to the level of humanity, and was debased

---

1 Dissertations on important subjects in religion, No. XVI. Vol. III. p. 105 &c.

2 Compare Jacobi's Dissertt. &c. Vol. II. p. 160 &c.

3 On the dissemination of the doctrines of the Old Testament, by tradition, see Köppen, sup. cit. Vol. II. p. 309—321. (2d ed. p. 333—343).

by human passions." "Moreover, the principle of unity, is manifestly a principle which our reason approves. In every science, reason searches for some one fundamental principle.—She requires one first cause, one ideal of perfection, one supreme lawgiver. And whenever reason has to content herself with plurality, as the ultimate and absolute in any thing; she feels that she has not yet attained a resting place: the innate demands of reason are not satisfied."[1]

The arguments by which Steger[2] has attempted to prove, that Moses did not teach the unity of God, admit of a satisfactory reply. See, in opposition to them, Stäudlin's Lehrbuch der dogmatik, p. 199 &c. and Jahn's Biblical Archaeology, Pt. III. § 14, where it is proved, that Moses did not teach the existence of merely a national God.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Among the texts which assert the unity of God, are the following: Deut. 4: 35, 39, יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים אֵין עוֹד מִלְבַדּוֹ Jehovah, he is God, and there is not another besides him. v. 39, יְהוָה הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל וְעַל־הָאָרֶץ מִתָּחַת אֵין עוֹד Jehovah, he is God, in the heavens above and upon the earth beneath, there is no other. Deut. 32: 39 אֲנִי אֲנִי הוּא וְאֵין אֱלֹהִים עִמָּדִי I, I am he, and there is no God with me. Is. 44: 6. 45: 5, 6, 14, 21, 22. 46: 9. Psalm 86: 10. John 17: 3, *μονος αληθινος θεος* the only true God. John 5: 44, *παρα του μονου θεου* from the only God. Rom. 3: 29, 30. 1 Tim. 2: 5. comp. James 2: 19. 1 Tim. 1: 17, *μονῳ θεῳ*. Jude 25. and 1 Cor. 8: 4—6, *ουδεις θεος ἑτερος, ει μη εἱς—εἱς θεὸς ὁ πατηρ,*

---

1 "Religionslehre der Bibel," Vol. I. p. 12, 13. See also Carus' "Moral and religious philosophy," (in his posthumous work, Vol. 7, Leipsic, 1810, p. 263.)

2 Henke's Mag. for Religious philosophy, Vol. 4. No. 1. p. 135—157. "Developement of the opinions of Moses relative to the deities of the heathen."

ἐξ οὗ τα παντα there is no other God but one — one God, the Father, of whom are all things.

In the work on "the Object of the Gospel and epistles of John," § 95, it is remarked, that the context of John 17: 3, and 1 Cor. 8: 4—6, proves, that God the Father is denominated *the only true God*, in opposition to the *false deities of the heathen*. In the first passage (v. 2) the phrase πασα σαρξ all flesh, refers to this contradistinction; and in the second passage, it is expressly mentioned.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Is. 44: 8, אֵין צוּר בַּל־יָדָעְתִּי "There is no other Being beside myself in whom unbounded confidence can be reposed, I know none." 43: 10, אֲנִי הוּא לְפָנַי לֹא־נוֹצַר אֵל I am he, before me there was no God formed. 44: 24, אָנֹכִי יְהוָה עֹשֵׂה כֹּל נֹטֶה שָׁמַיִם לְבַדִּי רֹקַע הָאָרֶץ מִאִתִּי I am Jehovah who made all things, who stretched out the heavens by myself, who spread abroad the earth by myself.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Deut. 6 : 4, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד Jehovah our God is one Jehovah. This is a figure of speech in which the subject of the proposition is repeated in the predicate, as is the case in John 3: 31; and it may be explained by Is. 45: 5, 6, 18. In these verses, the words אֲנִי יְהוָה וְאֵין עוֹד "I (he is called Jehovah v. 1, 3, 18) am Jehovah, and there is no other Jehovah." The name Jehovah, here used as the predicate of Jehovah, designates the greatness of Jehovah; by virtue of which he is able to foretell and to perform such great things (v. 1—3, 7, 19—21), and to be the Creator of the heavens and the earth (v. 18), which of course belong to him alone, to the exclusion of all whose greatness might be compared with his. The proper name Jehovah, is therefore in this place synonymous with the appellative *God;* and the words, "I am Jehovah, there is no

other Jehovah," signify the same as the words (in v. 5): "besides me, there is no God;" that is, no other is, what I Jehovah am—the character of God, which belongs to me, is ascribable to no other.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

Compare Job 4: 18, with 15: 15.—Even spirits of the higher orders are not perfectly pure.

§ 29.

Absolute selfexistence, eternity, and immutability of God.

As God does not derive his existence, from any other being, he must have "his life within himself," —ζωην εχει εν ἑαυτῳ John 5 : 26. This life in himself, is nothing else than his absolutely necessary existence (1); which renders it impossible that his existence should terminate (2), or that his power should be diminished, or any change in him occur (3), or that his existence should have had a beginning (4); in short, which renders him eternal (5).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The absolutely necessary existence of God.

1 Tim. 6 : 16 ὁ μονος εχων αθανασιαν who alone has immortality. The immortality here ascribed to God exclusively, must be something different from that immortality which belongs to all rational beings; it must denote the absolute necessity of his existence, such an existence as not only will never terminate, but which continues necessarily, and on account of this necessity neither had a beginning nor will have an end; in a word, an eternal life, ζωη αιωνιος 1 John 5: 20. 1: 2. comp. v. 1. John 1:1—3. But as absolute immortality belongs to God

exclusively, it follows that the spirits whom God has created, are not *necessarily* immortal; but as they began to exist, so they may cease to exist, if their Creator, on whose will they are dependent, should not wish their existence to continue.

That the word *αιωνιος*, in the phrase *ζωη αιωνιος* 1 John 5: 20, refers not only to future existence or immortality, but also to past existence, eternal preexistence; appears from 1 John 1: 1, *ὁ ην απ' αρχης*, which is equivalent to *εν αρχῃ* John 1 : 1, i. e. in the beginning of the world, before all creatures (John 1: 3), from eternity (Is. 43 : 13 in LXX). See the "Object of St. John," p. 385. Note, p. 437 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Ps. 102: 25, 27, 28, בְּדוֹר דּוֹרִים שְׁנוֹתֶיךָ: אַתָּה הוּא throughout eternity are thy years — thou art (he) the same, and thy years shall not terminate. Deut. 32: 40, חַי אָנֹכִי לְעֹלָם I live forever. Dan. 12: 7. Rev. 10: 6, *ζων εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων* living forever and ever.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Ps. 102: 27, 28, אַתָּה תַעֲמוֹד אַתָּה הוּא thou shalt endure —thou art the same. This immutability of the essence and attributes of God, renders the immutability of his purposes the more certain (§ 26).

On account of the immutability and indestructibility of his nature, God is called *αφθαρτος* incorruptible, Rom. 1 : 23. 1 Tim. 1: 17.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Ps. 90: 2, מֵעוֹלָם עַד־עוֹלָם אַתָּה אֵל from eternity to eternity thou art God.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Rom. 1: 20, *αϊδιος αυτου δυναμις και θειοτης* his eternal power and Godhead.

§ 30.

Incomparable excellence or infinity of the divine attributes.

As the highest excellences by which other beings are distinguished, must be regarded as nothing, in comparison with the divine attributes; God is termed the incomparable One (sanctus, ἅγιος, קָדוֹשׁ) (1); or he is the being who is separate from all other beings (2), and who cannot be compared to any other (3). This incomparable excellence, which philosophers and divines have denominated the *infinity*(4) or the boundless perfection of God (5), refers to his holiness (6), his justice (7), his power (8), and in short, to each divine perfection. If applied to his power, it is termed omnipotence (9); if to his knowledge, omniscience (10). Both are included in the expression, omnipresence (11). And on account of his infinite goodness, he is called the blessed God (μακαριος θεος 1 Tim. 1 : 11. 6 : 15), who needs the aid of no other, because he is selfexistent, (all things depending on him (12),) and the sum and substance of all grace (πασα χαρις 1 Pet. 5: 10), and love itself αγαπη 1 John 4: 8, 16 (13).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Is. 6: 3, קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts. Ezek. 38 : 23, וְהִתְקַדִּשְׁתִּי "I have proved myself the incomparable One." Ps. 22: 4. 99: 3, 5, 9. 111: 9 (here the predicate נוֹרָא is placed with קָדוֹשׁ, as in Ps. 99 :3) Rev. 4: 8, ἁγιος, ἁγιος, ἁγιος κυριος ὁ θεος ὁ παντοκρατωρ holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

1 Tim. 6: 16, φως οικων απροσιτον, ὁν ειδεν ουδεις ανθρωπων, ουδε ιδειν δυναται dwelling in inaccessible light, whom no

man hath seen or can see. 1 Tim. 6: 16. (קָדוֹשׁ, according to its primitive import, as is known, signifies, "*to separate* a thing from others.")

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Ex. 15: 11, מִי כָמֹכָה יְהוָה who is like thee, Jehovah? Ps. 77: 14, מִי־אֵל גָּדוֹל כֵּאלֹהִים who is so great a God as thou God art? Is. 40: 25, אֶל־מִי תְדַמְּיוּנִי וְאֶשְׁוֶה יאמַר קָדוֹשׁ "to whom will you compare me?" whom shall I resemble? saith the holy One, קָדוֹשׁ.[1] See also, on this incomparableness of God, the following passages: Ps. 86: 8—10. 89: 7—9. 113: 5. 148: 13. The expression *ἁγιοτης του θεου* Heb. 12: 10, seems also to signify the superior perfections of God, in general; as well his happiness as his moral perfection. Vide Comm. in loc. note n.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Ps. 145: 3, לְגָדֻלָּתוֹ אֵין חֵקֶר —LXX, *της μεγαλωσυνης αυτου ουκ εστι περας*· his greatness is unsearchable—has no end.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

In Job 11: 7—9, the immensity of God is represented in a poetic manner, according to height, depth, length, and breadth.[2]

ILLUSTRATION 6.

1 Pet. 1: 15, 16, *ἁγιοι γενεσθε, ὁτι εγω ἁγιος ειμι* be ye holy, because I am holy. As all the attributes of God, and especially his holiness, are distinguished from the characteristics of all other beings, by their greatness and elevation; so also should

[1] Michaelis has elucidated the meaning of קָדוֹשׁ, in a very appropriate manner, by the phrase of Horace: "Nil habens simile vel secundum." Supplem. ad Lex. Heb.

[2] The immensity of God, is that attribute of his greatness, which consists in its sustaining no relation to any known measure or standard;—his infinity signifies, that no divine perfection will admit of comparison with any finite excellence. See Carus' Religionsphilosophie, S. 284.

that people, whom he has separated from others, (*γενος εκλεκτον, εθνος ἁγιον*, a chosen generation, a peculiar people 1 Pet. 2: 9), be distinguished from others by their lives and principles, Lev. 20: 22, 23; so that the people of God may be distinguished from others, not only by the enjoyment of the divine blessing (v. 24), but also by their conduct ; or that they may be a peculiar people, קָדוֹשׁ v. 26.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Is. 5: 16, הָאֵל הַקָּדוֹשׁ נִקְדַּשׁ בִּצְדָקָה God who is holy, shall be sanctified in righteousness.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

Ps. 17 : 14. comp. with v. 12, 13. Ps. 98 : 1, זְרוֹעַ קָדְשׁוֹ his holy arm. 1 Pet. 3 : 14, 15. "Be not afraid of your enemies, but honour God so much, as to believe him more powerful and terrible, than the most terrible enemies," *ἁγιασατε τον θεον εν ταις καρδιαις ὑμων* sanctify the Lord in your hearts. Luke 1: 49, *εποιησε μοι μεγαλεια ὁ δυνατος, και ἁγιον το ονομα αυτου* he that is mighty hath done wonders for me, and venerable is his name.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

As God is subject to no other being, and as no being can be compared to him in any perfection (§ 28); it follows, that no one can resist his supreme and all-controlling power, Is. 43: 13. John 10: 29. Rom. 8: 31, 35 &c. 1 Cor. 15 : 27. And hence, nothing is impossible with God ; Gen. 18:14. Luke 1:37. Jer. 32: 27. Mark 10: 27, and he doth whatsoever he will. Is. 46: 10 &c. אֹמֵר עֲצָתִי תָקוּם וְכָל־חֶפְצִי אֶעֱשֶׂה saying, my purpose shall stand, and I will accomplish all my pleasure. Ps. 135 : 6. 115: 3. Eph. 1: 11, *παντα ενεργων κατα την βουλην του θεληματος αὐτου* working all things according to the counsel of his own will. And the power of God is the more unlimited, because in the formation and government of the world, he is not

a mere artificer, whose wishes could be controlled by the nature of the preexistent matter; but is a proper *Creator*, who by his fiat gave existence to both the matter and the form of the world. This boundlessness of the divine power, which makes all creation dependant solely on the divine will, and by virtue of which he actually created this world by his will; is described in the following passages: Ps. 33: 9, comp. v. 6. Rev. 4: 11. Jer. 23: 17.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

That God has a knowledge, not only of all those possible things which shall actually occur (§ 22. Illust. 11), but also of all those possible things which never did or will take place;—or in other words, that God possesses scientiam mediam (scientiam simplicis intelligentiae), is taught by the following passages: Jer. 38: 17—20. 1 Sam. 23: 11—13. Matth. 11: 21—23.

ILLUSTRATION 11.

A being is said to be omnipresent, whose agency and knowledge extend to every place, or are confined to no particular place. To the universal agency of God, the following passages refer: Amos 9: 2 &c. Acts 17: 27, 28, *ου μακραν απο ἑνος ἑκαστου ἡμων ὑπαρχει· εν αυτῳ γαρ ζωμεν και κινουμεθα και εσμεν* he is not far from each one of us; for in him we live and move and have our being. And his omniscience is alluded to in Ps. 139: 6—12. Jer. 23: 23. That God is not circumscribed or limited by place or space, is taught in 1 Kings 8: 27, הַשָּׁמַיִם וּשְׁמֵי הַשָּׁמָיִם לֹא יְכַלְכְּלוּךָ the heavens and the heavens of heavens cannot contain thee. Is. 66: 1. John 4: 20—24. We however, are not able to comprehend the relation which the substance of God bears to the objects which he beholds, or on which he exerts his agency. Nor ought we to be surprised at this incomprehensibility; for we are unable to comprehend the mode of the presence even of a human soul; and can only

infer that presence, from its agency, and the appearances manifested at a particular place; without knowing any thing of the *mode* of that presence which belongs to the unknown substance of a spiritual being. Compare Michaelis' Dogmatik, § 39. p. 174. and Reinhard's Dogmatik, § 36. p. 115.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

All things dependent on God.

Rom. 11: 34—36, *εις αυτον τα παντα* to him are all things. Acts 17: 24, *ου προσδεομενος τινος, αυτος διδους πασι ζωην και πνοην και τα παντα* he doth not need any thing, he giveth unto all, life and breath and all things.

As God alone possesses an absolutely necessary existence (§ 29. Illust. 1), it follows that the existence of all other things is a dependent existence; and as there is no necessary cause of the existence of things, at which reason is obliged to stop, excepting God; it appears that the existence of all things depends ultimately on God, John 1:1, 2. And he is the Creator, not only of living creatures, but also of inanimate objects; in a word, he is the Creator of all things (Illust. 9). Now, the more independent God is, and the more unlimited his power over all things, considered as being his property in the strictest sense;[1] the greater[2] should be that reverence with which we should adore his free bounty and unmerited patience, longsuffering, and forbearance;[3] 1 John 4: 10, 19, *αυτος πρωτος ηγαπησεν ημας* he first loved us. Rom. 9: 22, *πολλη μακροθυμια—πλουτος της δοξης επι σκευη ελεους* much longsuffering—the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy. On this passage, see the second Dissertation on the epistles to the Col. and Phil. Note 165.

---

1 See Michaelis, on the doctrine of sin and the atonement, § 5.

2 Job 40: 3—6. 42: 6. Rom. 9: 20 &c. 3 § 24. Illust. 8.

ILLUSTRATION 13.

1 Pet. 5 : 10, *ὁ θεος πασης χαριτος* the God of all grace: this properly stands for *ὁ θεος ὁς εστι πασα χαρις* the God who *is* all grace, Deus clementissimus. Vide Observv. ad analogiam et syntaxin Ebraicam, p. 234. In the passage 1 John 4 : 16, the substantive *αγαπη* stands in place of the superlative, Deus longe omnium amantissimus. Vid. ibid. p. 22.

PART II.

OF CREATION AND PROVIDENCE.

§ 31.

Every thing which exists, was both as to matter and form, produced by the will of God.

Agreeably to the idea of the divine Being which has been already established (§ 20), and which is now to be more particularly elucidated; God *created* the heavens and the earth (1), i. e. the world (2), or (3) the universe (4), all things visible (5) and invisible, animate [1] and inanimate (6); in other words, he, by an act of his will (7), brought into existence (8) that which had no existence, and which began to exist only because he willed it, or only in consequence of the efficiency of the divine will (9). The chaotic mass, also, out of which our earth [2] was formed (10), did not exist from eternity (11), but was created by God, was produced by his will.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Gen. 1: 1, בָּרָא (עָשָׂה) אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ God created the heavens and the earth. Ps. 121: 2. 102: 26. As the earth consists of land and water,[3] the inspired writers, instead of heaven and earth, use the expression, the heavens and the water (or sea) and the land (or earth); see Ps. 146: 6. Acts 14: 15, ὃς εποιησε τον ουρανον και την θαλασσαν, και παντα τα εν αυτοις who made the heaven and the earth and the sea and all things in them; compare Rev. 10: 6. 14: 7. Neh. 9: 6.

---

[1] John 1: 4. § 30. Illust. 12. [2] Gen. 1: 2. v. 3.

[3] Gen. 1: 9 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Acts 17: 24, *ὁ ποιησας τον κοσμον* who made the world.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Col. 1: 16, *τα παντα τα εν τοις ουρανοις και τα επι της γης* all things which are in the heavens and on the earth. Jer. 10: 11, 12. comp. v. 16, הַכֹּל — חֶבֶל the earth—all things.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Heb. 2: 10. 3: 4, *εξ ου τα παντα—δι' ου τα παντα—ὁ τα παντα κατασκευασας, θεος* he from whom are all things—by whom are all things;—he who formed all things, is God. comp. 1 Cor. 8: 6. Rom. 11: 36.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Col. 1: 16, *τα ὁρατα και τα αορατα* things visible and things invisible.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

John 1: 3, *χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε ἑν, ὁ γεγονε* without him was nothing made which was made.

NOTE. In the work, "Uber den Zweck Johannis," (p. 183 &c.), it is remarked, that the words *χωρις — γεγονεν* would be a superfluous supplement to *παντα δι' αυτου εγενετο*, if they were not directed against a party of Gnostics, who regarded God as the creator of only the invisible world, whilst they ascribed the creation of the visible world (*κοσμος* verse 10), to another power unacquainted with God.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Psalm 33: 6, בִּדְבַר יְהוָה by the word of Jehovah. v. 9, הוּא אָמַר וַיֶּהִי הוּא צִוָּא וַיַּעֲמֹד he spake and it existed, he commanded and it stood there. Is. 48: 13, קֹרֵא אֲנִי אֲלֵיהֶם יַעַמְדוּ יַחְדָּו when I call unto them, they stand up together. Thus, in the epistle to the Hebrews 11: 3, the word בָּרָא (Gen. 1: 1) is explained as denoting a production by the word or will of God,

ῥηματι θεου· and in Rev. 4 : 11, δια το θελημα σου εισι (τα παντα), και εκτισθησαν by thy will (all things) are, and were created, or, "in consequence of thy will, all things came into existence *or* were created;" the signification here given to και, is its signification in Luke 12: 38 comp. Mark 13 : 35. James 4: 13, σημερον και αυριον to day or to morrow.[1] It is true, we cannot comprehend the mode of the divine agency in creation, or the nature of the creative will. But even the imperfect idea of creation, which at least excludes a preexistent matter and all external auxiliary means, and ascribes the incomprehensible work of creation to God alone, is of great importance to us. Compare § 30. Illust. 9, 12.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

Heb. 11: 3, εις το μη εκ φαινομενων τα βλεπομενα γεγονεναι so that the things which we see, were not formed out of any thing preexistent. The same thing is thus expressed in 2 Macc. 7 : 28, εξ ουκ οντων εποιησεν αυτα (τον ουρανον και την γην) ὁ θεος. In this case, φαινομενα is equivalent to οντα; for as there existed nothing except God, which could see or know, φαινομενα must signify something which was visible to *him* (God), and consequently the sense must be this: God did not create the world out of any thing.

See Comment. on Heb. 11: 3, Note e.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Gen. 1: 1, "God created the heavens and the earth *in the beginning*;" i. e. when he created the world, there was a beginning made to every thing except God.[2] John 1: 1—3, παντα εγενετο—ὁ γεγονε all things were made—which were made. John 17: 5, 24, προ του τον κοσμον ειναι,—προ καταβολης κοσ-

1 See the Comment. on Heb. 8: 2, Note n. and also Schleusner's Lex. art. και, No. 12.

2 Comment. on Heb. 11: 3, Note d.

μου before the world was,—before the foundation of the world. and Eph. 1: 4. 1 Pet. 1: 20. Ps. 90: 2.

ILLUSTRATION 10.

If we suppose that the formation of the earth is represented (Gen. 1: 2) as a formation out of a mass of preexistent matter, we must nevertheless regard this formation, not as the natural operation of the preexistent mass; on the contrary, it was the effect of the same creative will, or omnipotence, by which God had previously created the heavens and the chaotic mass out of which our earth was formed. Gen. 1: 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים and God said; compare with Ps. 33: 6, בִּדְבַר־ יְהוָה by the word of Jehovah.

NOTE. In the Dissertation on the "Object of the death of Jesus," appended to the Comment. on Hebrews,[1] it is said: "In the formation of the earth, whatever God willed, instantly existed just as he wished it. The interval between the production of things in the beginning of one day, and the production of others at the commencement of another, only facilitated to spectators (the superior spirits), the discrimination and contemplation of the divine works. To these spirits, who could not possibly have been spectators of the production of their own world and of themselves; the truth, that God is the author of every thing which exists, would be presented in the most visible and distinct manner, by the gradual formation of the earth before their eyes. The earth, which they first beheld "without form and void," in a short time appeared before their eyes clothed in magnificence. And as it did not at once arrive at this state, but during successive portions of time; they could the more easily perceive and contemplate the principal kinds of excellence which the omnipotent will of the Creator gradually bestowed on this work of his; and by comparing each successive

1 P. 621 &c.

state of the earth with that which immediately preceded it, they could appreciate the peculiar value of every successive exertion of the divine will, and the suitableness of every new arrangement; and thus become the more firmly convinced of the wisdom of all the arrangements of God in the other world," Comp. § 32. Illust. 4.

These remarks may serve as a refutation of the objections, which those who regard the Mosaic account of the creation as a mythological or allegorical narrative, or as a philosophical speculation, urge against the literal, historical interpretation of it. A collection of the principal views which have been entertained of the Mosaic narrative of the creation, together with the arguments for and against them, is contained in "Eichhorn's Urgeschichte," edited by Gabler, with notes and an Introduction, II parts in 3 vols. 1790—92. compare (Bauer's) "Theology of the Old Testament," Leipsic, 1796, § 64—66. They may be reduced to the following:

1. The Mosaic account of the creation is a real and true history, which must be interpreted in a more or less literal manner.

2. It is not a true and real history; but

(a) A historical fable. In refutation of this opinion, see Ewald's Religionslehre der Bibel, Vol. I. p. 147. and Bauer's Hebraische Mythologie, B. I. S. 67—76.

(b) A philosophem—the reflexions of some ancient sage. On this view of the subject, see Ziegler's Critique on the dogma of creation, in Henke's Mag. Vol. II. and Bauer's Hebrew Mythology, Vol. I. p. 63 &c. Stäudlin's Lehrbuch der Dogmatik.

(c) An allegory, poesy, a figurative representation. See Teller's Aelteste Theodicee. and Ewald, ubi supra, p. 133 &c.

In opposition to the hypothesis of Eichhorn, (advanced in

Urgesch. in Repertor. for Biblical and Oriental Literature, Pt. 4,) that the account of the creation, is a fiction of Moses, made for the purpose of recommending in a sensible manner, the sanctification of the Sabbath or Seventh day; we find the following remarks, in the "Dissert. on the Object of the death of Jesus," (p. 623 &c.): "Such a holy fraud militates against the accredited authority of a divine messenger.—It would have cast suspicion on the authority of Moses, and could not have answered the intended purpose; for it was only the belief in the divine authority of Moses, which could, in the view of the Israelites, have imparted the sanction of a divine institution to the law relative to the observance of the Sabbath."

And in answer to the objections to the literal interpretation of Gen. ch. 1: "how could the succession of day and night be effected, prior to the fourth day, on which the relation between the sun and our earth, was first established; and how could vegetation have taken place on the third day, without the solar heat?" it is remarked in the same work: "It was not necessary that the light which caused the distinction between day and night, should have proceeded from the sun;—and for the productions of the vegetable kingdom, the omnipotence of God required not the influence of the solar rays."

ILLUSTRATION 11.

The remarks of Jerusalem, in his "Meditations on the principal truths of religion" (Pt. I. p. 12 &c.), and those of Jacobi, in his "Miscell. Dissertations" (Collect. II. No. I. § 1. No. II. p. 1 &c. 26 &c.), against the eternity of the world, merit particular attention. We have no occasion to deny, that when our earth was formed, together with the rest of the universe, (Gen. 1: 1), though for particular reasons the whole was תֹּהוּ וָבֹהוּ Gen. 1: 2; yet the mass forthwith received the particular form and structure which is described Gen. 1: 3 &c. In other

words, we may well admit that the creation of the chaotic mass, preceded its formation into a world, by an imperceptibly brief space of time. Compare Gen. 2: 1—4. Ex. 20: 11, where the formation of the earth and the creation of the universe are combined. With regard to God, who has happiness within himself, and is independent of all things without himself; it is immaterial whether we date the existence of the world, earlier or later.[1] And as for the arguments derived from particular productions of nature, in favor of the extreme antiquity of our earth;—they by no means establish the point in support of which they are adduced; because neither the causes of these productions nor the length of time requisite for their formation, can be certainly determined; and the hypotheses formed on this subject, have no authority, being merely the conjectures of the strenuous advocates of the extreme antiquity of the earth. See Döderlein's "Institutio Theol. Christ. § 127. Obs. 1. and Zöllner, in the "Berlin Monthly Magazine" for Octob. 1787, No. 2. Schlegel, "On the Trinity," Pt. I. p. 112. and Carl Ulyss. von Salis Marschlin's Reisen in Neapel, All. lit. Zeit. for 1795, No. 66. p. 522.

§ 32.

Mediate creation.

God must also be regarded as the mediate Creator (1) of all those things which are generated by others; because he created all the creatures and things which propagate, and he endowed them with the power of propagation, for the very purpose that they they should bring forth "after their kind" (2).

---

[2] Jerusalem's "Meditations &c." Ft. II. p. 448 &c.

In like manner, God is, properly speaking, the source from which all living creatures derive the good which flows to them through the medium of their fellow creatures (3). For from God all creatures derived their powers, which were bestowed on them with a view (4) to their promoting the happiness of one another (5). To God, therefore, our gratitude is due, for all the good which we derive from the powers and agency of universal nature (6).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Acts 17: 25, *αυτος διδους πασι ζωην* he gave life to all. v. 28, *εν αυτῳ εσμεν* "by him we were brought into existence—to him we are indebted for our being." See Dissert. I, in Libror. N. T. histor. aliquot loca, p. 92; where the whole passage is thus rendered: "to him we are indebted for our comfortable existence (*ζωμεν*), for the continuance of our powers (*κινουμεθα*), and even for our existence itself (*εσμεν*)." 1 Tim. 4:3 &c. *παν κτισμα θεου* every creature of God. Matth. 6: 30. comp. Heb. 2: 11, *εξ ἑνος παντες* all are of one. Eccl. 12: 1, בּוֹרְאֶיךָ thy Creator. Job 33: 4, רוּחַ־אֵל עָשָׂתְנִי the Spirit of God made me. Rev. 8: 9, *το τριτον των κτισματων* the third part of the creatures.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

In Gen 1: 28. 22: 11 &c. it is said, God created man and animals and plants, ordaining that they should perpetuate their species. And in Gen. 8: 17. 9: 1, we learn, that according to the divine purpose, this propagation was to continue after the flood.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Hos. 2: 21, 22. comp. Psalm 104: 27, 28. 145: 15 &c, אַתָּה נֹתֵן לָהֶם אֶת־אָכְלָם בְּעִתּוֹ thou givest to them their food in

its proper time. 147: 8 &c. 14. Job 38: 41. Jer. 5 : 24. 14: 22. Matth. 5: 45, *τον ηλιον αὐτου ανατελλει — και βρεχει* maketh his sun arise—and sendeth rain. 6 : 25—33. 1 Tim. 6: 17. Acts 14: 17, *ουρανοθεν διδους ὑετους και καιρους καρποφορους, εμπιπλων τροφης και ευφροσυνης τας καρδιας ἡμων* gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with nourishment and joy. 17: 25, *διδους τα παντα·* v. 28, *εν αυτῳ ζωμεν* to him we owe it, that we live in prosperity and gladness. see Illust. 1.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

It seems as if God, who could certainly have created the world in an instant, employed a series of days in forming it, for the purpose of conveying to the angels, (who were present at the creation, Job 38 : 4 — 7), an ocular demonstration of the wisdom of his plans; and that the narrative of it might be adapted to our comprehension, and yet be true and convey to us distinct and correct views of his designs. Compare § 31. Illust. 10 Note.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Gen. 1: 14—17, 29 &c. 8: 22. Ps. 104: 10—24. 1 Tim. 4: 3, *βρωματα ἁ ὁ θεος εκτισεν εις μεταληψιν* meats which God created to be received.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

1 Tim. 4 : 3 &c. 1 Cor. 10 : 26, 30 &c. Rom. 14 : 6, *ὁ εσθιων, κυριῳ εσθιει, ευχαριστει γαρ τῳ θεῳ* he that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth thanks to God. 1: 20. Psalm 104: 1, 33 &c. 147: 7.

§ 33.

Preservation of the world.

We are the more indebted to God for the powers and properties of nature, and for the benefits we derive from them; because the world, even when created, cannot support itself, but is upheld by him who formed it (1). For the creatures could not continue in existence and be active, if God did not will their continuance in being, and their retention of those powers by which they act. (Ps. 104: 29. comp. § 29. Illust. 1.) The same divine power (2) which created the universe, also upholds it (3).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

All things belong, in the most unlimited sense, to him who brought them into existence. He is Lord over the universe, in a sense in which no other can be lord over any thing: Ps. 50: 10—12, לִי תֵבֵל וּמְלֹאָהּ the earth belongs to me and the fulness of it. Matth. 11: 25. Acts 17: 24, *ουρανου και γης κυριος υπαρχων* being Lord of heaven and of earth. 1 Cor. 8 : 4—6, *εἷς κυριος* one Lord.

That *κυριος* is here a name of God, denoting his universal Lordship, is proved in the work "On the object of St. John's Gospel," p. 463, from the following considerations: 1. Because the phrases, *λεγομενοι θεοι* and *θεοι και κυριοι*, in v. 5, are evidently synonymous; and 2. Because we find, in v. 6, that *θεος εξ οὗ τα παντα*, and *κυριος δι' οὗ τα παντα*, are considered as two predicates of the same import. Comp. *δια* and *εκ* Rom. 3 : 30. Gabler, in his Theolog. Journal, proves that *κυριος* with and without the article, is used as well of God as of Jesus Christ. Vol. I. p. 11.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Heb. 1 : 3, compared with 11: 3. In the first passage, we find *φερων τα παντα τῳ ῥηματι της δυναμεως αὐτου* supporting all things with the word of his power; and in the second, *νοουμεν κατηρτισθαι τους αιωνας ῥηματι θεου* we know that the world was formed by the word of God. In the former, the preservation of the universe is ascribed to *ῥημα θεου*· and in the latter, creation is referred to the same divine attribute. To this place belongs also the text, 2 Pet. 3: 5, *γη εξ ὑδατος και δι' ὑδατος συνεστωσα, τῳ του θεου λογῳ* "the earth was produced by the divine will (Gen. 1: 9), out of the water (v. 2, 9); and in like manner was preserved by the divine will, notwithstanding the water (of the flood)." (*Δια* signifies *notwithstanding*, in Rom. 2: 27. 4: 11. 1 Tim. 2: 15.[1] and thus the Hebrew ב is used Deut. 1: 32, בַּדָּבָר and Ps. 78: 32, בְּכָל־זֹאת).

Comp. Ps. 104: 6—9. Job 38: 10, 11.—The word *συνεστωσα* is used for *συνεστωσα ην*, and has in this place a twofold[2] meaning. In connexion with the first preposition εξ, it signifies the origin[3] and production of the earth from the water; but in connexion with the second preposition *δια*, it signifies the preservation[4] of the earth, which is also ascribed to the *λογος θεου* in 2 Pet. 3: 7.[5]

---

1 Vide Dissert. De sensu vocis *πληρωμα*, Note 2. and Dissert. On the object of the death of Jesus, p. 526.

2 There are other instances in which a single word has a double signification, and though mentioned but once, stands in more than a single connexion: e. g. Heb. 5: 11. and Tit. 2: 6, 8. See on the former, the Note in loc. in the "Comment. on Hebrews;" and on the latter, "Dissert. in Epp. Pauli minorum aliquot loca," p. 53.

3 On this signification of *συνιστημι*, compare Kypke, on 2 Pet. 3: 5. and Schleusner's Lex. in voc. No. 4.

4 This is a very common ellipsis, which is derived from a Hebrew idiom, in the Observv. ad analogiam et syntaxin Ebraicam, p. 135 &c. See also Dissert. II, in libror. N. T. histor. aliquot loca, p. 26.

The word *συνιστημι* likewise signifies, to preserve, in Col. 1:17. See Dissert. I, in Epist. ad Coloss. Note 28. and Schleusner's Lex. sup. cit. No. .

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Acts 17 : 25, *αυτος διδους πασι πνοην* — v. 28, *κινουμεθα* he gave breath to all — we move. Both expressions refer to the continuance and preservation of the natural faculties and powers. Compare Dissert. I, in libror. N. Test. aliquot loca, p. 92. Col. 1 : 17, *τα παντα εν αυτῳ συνεστηκε* by him all things subsist, compared with Heb. 1: 3. Neh. 9: 6, אַתָּה מְחַיֶּה אֶת־כֻּלָּם thou preservest them all. Gabler, in his Journal (for 1807), shews that the preservation and creation of the world, may be separated, although both are contained in the proposition : "the entire ground of the existence of the world, is in the will of God." "The same eternal and immutable act of God, is, by the idea of creation, referred to the origin and being of the world ; and by the idea of preservation, to its continuance."

On the question, whether in the preservation of the world we must consider God as exerting a continued and immediate agency ; see Reinhard's Dogmatik, § 61. No. 2. and Schott, Epitom. theol. christol. dog. p. 66. Note c.

§ 34.

The divine government of the world.

The *Lord* of the world, also *governs* (1) the world, and overrules the various operations of natural causes to the accomplishment of his purposes (2). The world consists partly of mechanical, and partly of free moral agents. As the latter constitute the great object of creation (3), the divine government of the world consists in this : that God pays the most vigilant attention to the free actions

his agency is exerted ~~needs~~ in the preservation of the world; both mediately, and immediately

of all rational beings (§ 17), and that he governs the rest of the world in a manner accordant with the great moral end which he has in view. § 18. Illust. 7.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Ps. 145 : 13, מַלְכוּתְךָ מַלְכוּת כָּל־עֹלָמִים thy kingdom is an eternal kingdom. Ps. 66: 7, מֹשֵׁל בִּגְבוּרָתוֹ עוֹלָם he governs by his power forever. 1 Tim. 1:7, *βασιλευς των αιωνων* Governor of the worlds. 1 Chron. 29: 11, 12.

NOTE. In the Comm. on the Hebrews (ch. 1 : 2. Note e), it is remarked that *βασιλευς των αιωνων* cannot well signify here, *eternal* Governor ; because it would have been more natural for St. Paul, who places three adjectives in immediate succession, to say *αιωνιος* · and because the predicate *eternal* is comprehended in the subsequent word *αφθαρτος*. Michaelis remarks that the Hebrew expression עוֹלָם among the Rabbins, commonly signifies *world ;* and that the plural עֹלָמִים , *αιωνες*, probably originated from a Rabbinical division of the world into upper and lower. Introduction to N. T. Pt. II. p. 1378, 4th edition. See also Heinrich, on 1 Tim. 1: 17.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Ephes. 1 : 11, *ενεργων παντα κατα την βουλην θεληματος αὐτου*. Col. 1:16, *παντα εις αυτον εκτισται*, "every thing is so constituted as to be dependent on him ; all things shall accomplish his will, and promote his honour (his purposes). See Dissert. I, in epist. ad Coloss. Note 27. *Εις αυτον* is used in the same sense, in Rom. 11 : 36. 1 Cor. 8 : 6. Comp. Kypke on Luke 12: 21. Koppe on Rom. 11: 36. and Schleusner's Lex. voc. *εις* No. 24.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

When it is said, that God exercises a special or particular providence over his rational creatures ; it is not supposed, that

his knowledge of the other creatures is less perfect, or that his attention to them is less. This cannot be supposed of the omniscient God, Matth. 10: 29. Luke 12: 6. But, while he treats rational moral beings according to the rank which he has assigned them in the universe, that is, as beings of a nobler species, and who are more nearly related to himself (*γενος θεου*);[1] he also treats the lower orders of creatures, according to their respective ranks and the design of their creation. § 18. Illust. 7. The providence of God over all created beings and things, is termed providentia generalis; that over the human family, is termed specialis; and that over those persons who are distinguished for virtue and piety, is called specialissima. See Sartorii compend. § 125, 130. comp. Doederlin Institutio Theologi christiani, § 173. Observ. 2. and Reinhard's Dogmat. § 65.

The idea of special, and of most special providence, discussed in Stäudlin's Dogmat. p. 218, comes near to the customary division into ordinary and extraordinary providence.

On the institutions of the divine providence and government, for the moral good of the human family; see Reinhard's "Syst. der Moral," B. IV. S. 133—218.

§ 35.

It is possible that God should, by immediate interposition, suspend or alter the course of nature in the material world.

In consequence of our ignorance of the interior of nature, we cannot determine, whether it was possible for God, without prejudice to the freedom of rational beings, which he would not violate, to adopt

[1] Luke 12: 7. Matth. 6: 26—30. Acts 17: 28.

such a constitution of the world at the time of the creation, and to establish the course of nature so unalterably, that his purposes would be fully accomplished by the agency of mere natural causes, and in the natural course of things, without any interposition or immediate influence from him on the created world. We cannot determine, whether it would not be an absolute impossibility, so to frame the world, that every thing at variance with the divine purposes and the welfare of his individual rational creatures, should be prevented, by the mere laws and powers of mechanical nature, without any immediate interference of the Creator; and yet, that the freedom of rational creatures should not be infringed, amid the various consequences which may result from the influence of rational beings upon nature, in consequence of its mere mechanical powers and laws. We must at least admit, that in those cases in which the adaptation of the course of nature to the moral ends and the moral condition of rational beings, cannot otherwise be secured, it is effected by the immediate interposition of God (1). Nor does this admission in the least derogate from the honour, the power, or the intelligence of God. For contradictory things are not subject to power (2). And it is by no means necessary, that we should regard these occasions for the divine interposition, as unforeseen by God. On the contrary, we must consider these interpositions as having been determined on from eternity (3). Moreover, such immediate influence of God on the course of nature, does not suspend the laws of nature, although the course of nature is altered, and a train of events produced, different from that which would have occurred, if the powers of nature had been left to proceed in their ordinary course.

For, the laws of nature are not so constituted as to produce the same results under all circumstances. On the contary, they are suspended on conditions; and according as one or the other of these conditions occurs, different effects are produced; yet all equally agreeable to the laws of nature. Thus, for example, without the least violation of the laws of nature, this or another very different event may take place, according as this or another free agent exerts his influence upon nature, or exerts this or another kind of influence, or no influence at all (4).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The Scriptures represent that as *certain*, which we have above proved to be *not impossible*. They refer the future resurrection of the dead and future retribution, to the immediate divine agency (of God or Christ). Phil. 3: 21, *κατα την ενεργειαν του δυνασθαι αυτον και ὑποταξαι ἑαυτῳ τα παντα* according to the working, by which he is able also to subdue all things unto himself. Matth. 22: 29, *δυναμιν θεου* the power of God, 16: 27, *μελλει ερχεσθαι εν τῃ δοξῃ του πατρος αὐτου* shall come in the glory of his Father. John 5: 20—29. Acts 26: 8.

See Kant's "Only possible ground of evidence for demonstrating the existence of God," p. 84 &c. Compare Stäudlin's "Critique on the system of the christian religion," p. 202.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

It is very possible, that God would have been obliged to bind the various operations of natural causes to such laws as would have infringed the freedom of rational beings, and thus have counteracted his own purpose; or if he did choose to do this, it is possible that the course of nature would have militated against his other purposes, unless prevented by his imme-

diate agency.[1] But the inscrutable God may also have had other reasons why he chose not to exclude himself entirely from all immediate connexion with his world; and perhaps would not create a world which should be governed by an everlasting mechanism. Compare James Foster's Meditations on the principal doctrines of natural religion, Chap. 7. vol. I. p. 302 &c. Rehkopf's Elements of practical christian theology, § 227, p. 359. Müller's New View of christian doctrines, p. 106 &c. "Bibliothek von Anzeigen kleiner akademischer Schriften," Vol. II. part 3. p. 13. "Summary view of the principal doctrines of religion, in aphorisms," 1791, § 167. "Paul; or a vindication of the apostles of Jesus &c." by Hildebrand, Pt. I. p. 250 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Compare Köppen's work, Pt. I. p. 46 (2d ed. p. 56).

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Just as free creatures, without the least violation of the laws of nature, very frequently change the natural train of events; so also can God, in perfect accordance with the laws of nature, either himself exert an influence on the created world, or he may commission other spirits, such as angels[2] to exert their

---

1 "No one (says Kant) can be so inflated with a sense of his own discernment, as to undertake to decide, whether that wonderful preservation of the various species in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, in which every new plant or animal generated, possesses the entire perfection of structure of its original; and (in the vegetable kingdom) all the delicate beauties of colour; so that each species of plants, at the return of every spring, is reinstated in all its unabated excellence, its seeds being protected from the destructive influence of disorganizing nature, during the unfavourable weather of fall and winter;—no one, I say, can determine, whether this is produced by the mere influence of natural causes, or whether it does not rather in every instance require the immediate influence of the Creator." Religionslehre, S. 115.

2 Acts 12: 7—11. 5: 19, 20.

agency; and thus cause effects to be produced which would never have been produced without this immediate or mediate interference of God, and effects which shall draw after them other effects, and greatly change the course of things in the world. For if we were to suppose it to be a law of nature, that God can never exert an immediate influence on the world, and that creatures are the only agents in this world; we should without any reason, take precisely that for granted, which is yet to be determined in this investigation. See Köppen sup. cit. p. 140 (2d ed. p. 200), and "A supplement to the Letters on the present state of christianity," by A. J. Roustan, p. 81 &c. On the immediate working of God upon nature, see also Vogel's "Faith and hope," in his Letters to Selmar and Eliza, Vol. I. Letter 9.

Note. The literal, historical interpretation of the narrative of the liberation of Peter by the angel, is vindicated in Dissert. II, in librorum N. T. histor. aliquot loca, p. 84 &c. againstt he explanation from natural causes, in Eichhorn's Allgem. Biblioth. der biblischen Litteratur, Vol. III. p. 381 &c.[1]

§ 36.

The reality of the immediate operation of God on the course of nature, is proved by the miracles recorded in the Scriptures.

That we not only have no reason to regard the immediate agency of God on the created world as improbable, but have proof of the reality of such agency, is evident (1) from that train of extraor-

1 See also Eck's explanation of the N. T. miracles from natural causes; Bauer's Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Testaments; and Heinrich's Acta apostolorum, Pt. II. Excurs. V. p. 359—362.

dinary events termed miracles. For, these miracles, if we regard them *not separately*, but in connexion with other events (§ 8. Illust. 4), were evidently performed for a specific purpose, viz. to establish the authority of Jesus; and to this purpose, notwithstanding the variety of their nature, they all harmoniously tend. They must therefore be ascribed to some rational cause; and as they evidently transcend the power of man, their Author must be superhuman. These miracles the Scriptures expressly (2) ascribe to God (3).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The reality of immediate divine agency.

Luke 1: 35—37, *δυναμις ὑψιστου—ουκ αδυνατον παρα τῳ θεῳ παν ῥημα* the power of the Highest—nothing is impossible with God. Eph. 1: 19, 20, *ενεργεια του κρατους της ισχυος αυτου, ἣν ενηργησεν εν τῳ Χριστῳ εγειρας αυτον εκ νεκρων* the energy of his mighty power, which he exerted on Christ when he raised him from the dead. Acts 10: 38, *εχρισεν αυτον ὁ θεος πνευματι και δυναμει* God anointed him with the Spirit and with power. John 11: 41 &c, Jesus represented the miracle of the resuscitation of Lazarus as the effect of God's hearing his prayer, and of course as the act of God. John 5: 17, *ὁ πατηρ μου εργαζεται, κἀγω εργαζομαι* "as my Father performed miracles on the Sabbath day, so do I also."[1] John 11: 25 &c. Acts 4: 9 &c. (comp. § 44. Illust. 6. § 82. Illust. 10). 1 Cor. 12: 7—11, *παντα ταυτα ενεργει το ἑν και το αυτο πνευμα* all these things are wrought by that one and the same Spirit. Compare § 8, 10.

1 See on this passage, the work "On the object of the Gospel of St. John, p. 196.

Those who ascribe these miracles to recondite natural causes, and allege that these causes were provided (preformed) at the time of the creation; assume gratuitously the existence of causes, which can neither be proved from experience, nor rendered probable by any other reasoning (a priori, § 35). On the contrary, a preformation of natural causes for those miracles, is rendered improbable by the great diversity of their nature, being not confined either to particular persons and places, or to particular and specific modes of operation. Had they been performed only on particular persons and at particular places, we might possibly suppose, that the efficient cause of the phenomena, foreseen and foretold by a worker of miracles, lay in the original constitution of nature; or if these extraordinary effects had been of one or only a few specific kinds, we might possibly regard natural causes as adequate to their production. But as they were of so many various kinds, and were performed without thel east restriction of any sort, even on the most unexpected and accidental occasions, neither of the above suppositions is admissible. Compare § 8. Illust. 3, 4. § 21. Illust. 5. "Tübingen Gelehrter Anzeigen, 1789, p. 772 &c. Compare Eberhard's Spirit of primitive christianity, Vol. III. p. 153 &c. with Bonnet's Theory of the preformation of miracles.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Miracles were ascribed to the agency of God.

This was done by the explicit declarations of the persons by whom the miracles were performed. On some occasions also God himself, the proper Author of these miracles, (or at least, a superior being who acted by the command of God, § 35. Illust. 4,) manifested his presence, without the intervention of any human voice. John 1: 32 &c. 5: 37. Matth. 3: 16 &c. 17: 5. Acts 9: 3—7. 26: 13—16. Luke 1: 11 &c. 26 &c. Acts 12: 7. But the *inward feeling* which convinced the divine messen-

gers of the reality of an extraordinary influence of God on their souls, was confirmed and proved by such outward acts, as could not have been the mere figment of imagination, nor the effect of mere human volition. So also, in those cases in which the evidence of the presence of God or of an angel was perceived through the medium of the senses, the reality of that presence was confirmed by the connexion of those appearances with other incidents, which were either interwoven with the public life of the person concerned (John 1: 51);[1] or were connected immediately with those appearances themselves, (as, for example, Acts 9: 8—18. Luke 1: 13, 24, 36, 39 &c. 2: 12, 18. Acts 12: 7 &c.); or at least, were always of such a nature that they could not have been the effect of mere imagination, or the result of human knowledge or power. In like manner, we must ascribe to God those extraordinary phenomena which a divine messenger had not been particularly expected or requested to perform, but which, from their nature, relate to a person or transaction, in regard to which we have reason, from a prior declaration substantiated by miracles, to expect a special agency and an extraordinary assistance of God. Examples of such extraordinary incidents, which had not been predicted by any divine messenger, are found in Matth. 27: 50—53. 1 Sam. 5: 6. 2 Sam. 6: 7. The miracles mentioned in the first passage, and which occurred immediately after the death of Jesus, although they had not been foretold, are with propriety regarded, not as accidental occurrences, but as effects produced by divine power, for the purpose of authenticating the divinity of Christ's mission

1 "The open heaven and the ascending and descending," i. e. the ministry "of angels," denoted the visible evidence of the greatness of Jesus, or that series of miracles the performance of which he shortly after commenced. In this passage, Jesus had before his eye the miracle of the opening of the heavens (Matth. 3: 16), and the ministry of angels (4: 11), both of which had already taken place. See Dissert. I, in librorum N. T. histor. aliquot loca, p. 81 &c.

and doctrines; because this mission and these doctrines had been before authenticated by so many other miracles to which Jesus himself had appealed. John 10: 36, 37. So also the calamitous occurrences recorded 1 Sam. 6: 7, and 2 Sam. 6: 7, may justly be regarded as intentional acts of God; because they followed the transgression of a law of Moses (Num. 4:17—20), the divinity of whose mission and legislation had been proved by many miracles, Deut. 34: 10 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The view of *miracles*,[1] given in this §, is not applicable to *all* supernatural phenomena; but only to those which are to be regarded as indications and proofs of the reality of that internal divine influence which particular persons, such as Jesus and his apostles, profess to have experienced. It cannot be denied that God can, in a supernatural manner, not only awaken certain ideas in the minds of individuals, but also produce at the same time a firm conviction of the supernatural and divine origin of these ideas (§ 7. Illust. 1).[2] But of the reality of such operations on the minds of individuals, others cannot be convinced, unless a persuasion of their reality is produced in their own minds by a similar supernatural divine influence, or unless the pretensions of the individuals to a supernatural influence, is substantiated by outward facts which are learned in the ordinary way, i. e. by experience or history, and which can be viewed as conclusive evidence of the truth of those professions. Now,

---

1 For different explanations of the nature of miracles, see Ammon's Commentatio de notione miraculi (Nov. Opusc. Theol. Göttingen, 1803, No. VIII, IX); his Dissertations elucidating the science of practical theology, Vol. I. No. 2. Stäudlin's Lehrbuch der Dogmatik, § 36. Süskind on the nature and possibility of miracles, Mag. für christlichen Dog. und Moral, St. III. No. 2.

2 See Schmidt's Moral Philosophy, p. 99 &c. (2d ed. p. 102). Kant's Religionslehre, p. 218, 142, 188.

if persons whose character gives them the strongest claims to credibility (§ 7), profess that the same divine Being to whom they attributed their doctrines (§ 6, 9), excited in them also the expectation of such miraculous phenomena in the material world (§ 8. Illust. 8. § 10. Illust. 26), phenomena the production of which the concurrent testimony of all past ages pronounces to have surpassed the ability of the ablest and most distinguished men, and which the experience of our own age proves to be beyond the power of any person living; and if the confident expectations of these men, which led them to announce and predict these extraordinary phenomena (§ 8), (however strange it may appear,) were actually followed (§ 5), and beyond all suspicion of deception (§ 8. Illust. 4), by the occurrence of those very phenomena, and this not only in one or in several instances, but in every instance and uniformly and without fail (§ 8. Illust. 6); would it not betray an unreasonable obstinacy, if, in defiance of all these facts, we should still doubt the correctness of these men's conviction of the divine origin of their doctrines, and especially since we are compelled to admit the possibility of such a conviction? To others, to whom this inward conviction could not be communicated, the truth and certainty of that personal consciousness from which Jesus and his apostles derived their conviction of the divine origin of their doctrines, are adequately proved by those miracles which most visibly and invariably followed the declaration of these persons that they had an internal intimation and an expectation of them (πιστις § 38). Whenever the Spirit of God, acting through his messengers, produced visible effects (Acts 10: 38. Matth. 10: 28. compare § 82), which, according to the experience of all ages, no other persons could produce; that Spirit, though himself invisible, gave a demonstration that he really exerted an influence upon those his messengers who ascribed their doctrines to him (John

3: 34. Luke 4: 14), and proved that those doctrines, as well as the visible miraculous works, originated from himself, and were therefore true, because he, the Instructor of mankind by his divine messengers, is true.[1] Nor should our inability to discriminate between absolute and relative miracles, involve us in doubt respecting the object of them.[2] Whether these miracles were of an absolute or relative kind, is a matter of no importance here; for in either case, it is certain that their avowed (and not merely afterwards conjectured) object,[3] as stated by the persons themselves who wrought the miracles, was, to evince the truth of their conviction and profession of the inward influence of God upon their souls. Jesus and his apostles most certainly could not have accomplished this object, by the performance of numerous and various miracles, which always followed when they expected them, and which could not have been the result of chance;[4] unless either natural talents superior to those of all other men had been given them, or a superior (a superhuman) being produced these miracles through their instrumentality. Now, if it was the Lord of nature himself, (and the great variety of the miracles of Jesus and his apostles, most na-

---

1 1 John 5: 6. In the work on the Object of John, p. 227, the words *και το πνευμα —αληθεια* are explained thus: "The Spirit, or the gift of working miracles, which was promised by Jesus for the confirmation of faith in him (John 6: 38. 14: 12), and which still continues since his exaltation, proves the fact that the Spirit is true, *αληθεια* i. q. *αληθης*,) that Spirit which since the exaltation of Jesus, promulgates the doctrine that Jesus is the Son of God." The miracles of the Spirit testify to the truth of his doctrines. By *πνευμα*, in the first clause, some interpreters (such as Grotius and Gabler) understand the miracles of Christ; others, the religious views and feelings of christians, which are the effects of christian doctrines; Knapp includes in the testimony of the Spirit, all the evidences for the divinity of the person and doctrines of Jesus, in general: his miracles, his resurrection, and the internal excellence of his doctrines. See Löfler's Comment. Theolog. Paulus' Introd. to New Test. p. 144.

2 Schmidt, sup. cit. p. 108. 3 § 8. Illust. 1, 2, 6. § 10, 19.

4 § 8. Illust. 6.

turally leads us to the omnipotence of the God of nature as their cause,) who in fact produced these phenomena, so that they were absolute miracles, wrought immediately by God himself; then God, by his immediate agency, did promote the purposes of those who instrumentally wrought the miracles; and the miracles actually evince, what they profess, that he exerted an inward influence on their souls, to prove which, was, according to their declaration, the real object of those miracles. But if we regard these miracles as relative, then they must either have been performed by a spirit of a higher rank, acting by divine command,[1] or by the extraordinary natural talents of Jesus and his apostles. If the former was the case, then God did actually confirm what Jesus and his apostles wished to prove by those miracles, namely, that their souls were under the influence and agency of God. For it is one and the same thing, whether this declaration be confirmed immediately by God, or mediately by a superior spirit acting under him. Thus, for example, the declaration of God that Jesus is the Messiah, is just as valid when made through the instrumentality of angels (Luke 2: 9—14. 1: 30—33), as when given immediately by himself (Matth. 3: 17. 17: 5. comp. John 5: 37. 2 Pet. 1: 17).—If the latter be the case, if the miracles were wrought by the extraordinary natural powers of Jesus and his apostles, which is in the highest degree improbable (Illust. 1); even on this very improbable supposition, the affirmation is not invalidated, that the object of the Author of nature in originally bestowing on them the extraordinary tallents by which they wrought these miracles, was the same as that which they themselves wished to accomplish by them.[2] For, as the character of the miracles which Jesus wrought, corresponded so perfectly with the doctrines which he wished to confirm by them; we should be obliged to admit, that the Au-

1 § 8. Illust. 7.

2 § 8. Illust. 1, 2, 6.

thor of nature intended to substantiate the doctrines of Jesus; and that he had no other object in view, as he gave Jesus ability to perform precisely such miracles, and only such, as corresponded perfectly with the doctrines he taught. Moreover, as those miracles recorded in the New Testament, which were performed by other persons beside Jesus, such as those wrought by his apostles and by his seventy disciples (Luke 10: 17), and even by those who were not professed disciples of Jesus [1]—as all these miracles unitedly tend to support the authority of Jesus,[2] or that of his apostles [3] which depended on his;[4] it necessarily follows, that we must believe that the object of these miracles was, to establish the authority of Jesus and his apostles, even if we adopt the supposition, that they were performed by virtue of some natural powers to work miracles. And why should it be supposed, that the Author of nature, in bestowing on these persons the power of working miracles, had any other object in view, than that which Jesus had when he wrought them, and which he openly avowed, namely, to establish his doctrines and authority? For the miracles of all these different persons harmonized most perfectly, for the accomplishment of this same purpose; nay, their nature was such, that they were confined to this single purpose.[5] Thus, for example, Paul could not use

---

1 Mark 9: 38. Matth. 7: 22.

2 Mark 6: 7, he gave them power over unclean spirits. Acts 3: 16. 4: 7—10, 30. Luke 10: 17. Mark 9: 38. Matth. 7: 22.

3 Comp. the Dissertation "Von der Geistes Gaben der Korinthischen Christen, Neues Repert. Th. III. S. 346. See also supra, § 10. Illust. 27.

4 John 13: 20. 14: 13, 14. 15: 4, 7. Acts 3: 12—16. 2 Cor. 4: 5. § 9, 10.

5 Mark 9: 39. 1 Cor. 12: 3. In the "Dissert. on the epistles to the Corinthians," this passage is thus explained: no one who speaks in a strange language (*εν πνευματι θεου*), can detract from Jesus; and no one that speaks in a strange language, can praise Jesus, unless by the influence of the Holy Spirit. Opusc. Academ. Vol. II. p. 319. The miraculous gift of speaking in strange languages, could therefore be used *only* in honour of Jesus.

his miraculous powers in vindication of his Pharisaic principles, and in opposition to christianity (Gal. 1: 14, 23); but was then only enabled to exert them, when he wished to use them in confirmation of the authority and doctrines of Jesus; for while he was yet persecuting Jesus and his followers, he wrought no miracles, but assailed them only with imprisonment and punishments. But although this latter hypothesis, improbable as it is, would not militate against the authority of Jesus and his apostles, still the supernatural interference of God with the ordinary course of nature, can be proved only by those miracles, which were either absolute in their nature, or relative of the first class, that is, such as were wrought by a spirit of a higher order acting by command of God.

§ 37.

The possibility of other supernatural operations of God in the world, beside miracles.

If it be a fact, that God exerts a supernatural agency in the world, then it is possible, that some phenomena are produced by his agency, which cannot with propriety be denominated miracles (1); either because there is nothing strange (2) about them, or because we have no express declaration from God, to assure us that such is their nature (3).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

We sometimes meet with occurrences of an extraordinary nature which excite admiration, and yet, as they can be explained in different ways, and as we cannot ascertain to a certainty the agent by which they are produced, they are not valid proofs

or indications of a particular divine influence, like the proofs from miracles (σημεια John 6 : 25, 30, 2 Cor. 12 : 12. Mark 16 : 20, 17). And when any phenomenon is not intended to substantiate (§ 8, 10) the declarations of some divine messenger, who professes to have an invisible influence of God upon his soul (§ 6), but is produced merely that it may exist; it is neither important (§ 39) nor necessary, that we should be able to distinguish the ordinary from the extraordinary providence of God.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

We can easily imagine that in particular circumstances of time and place, the agency of some natural cause or causes, unknown to us, may render the occurrence of a certain event, which has nothing extraordinary in itself, impossible; unless the immediate agency of God is exerted. Moreover, there actually are some instances of the supernatural agency of God (the influences of grace), the supernatural origin of which cannot be discovered from their own nature, but must be learned exclusively from the declarations of God himself (§ 115). But as these divine influences are distinguished by nothing extraordinary to excite our astonishment,[1] and as they make no deep impression on our senses;[2] they do not point us distinctly to the superior cause whence they originate: and they are accordingly no evidence of the extraordinary agency of God (Illust. 1).

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Extraordinary occurrences, especially solitary ones (§ 8. Illust. 8), which we are unable to explain by the laws of nature known to us, may have been occasioned by the intervention of a circumstance which escaped our notice, or may be the natural effect of some cause with which we are unacquainted.

---

1 Comp. "Dissert. de efficientia Spiritûs Sancti, in mentibus humanis," § 20.

2 § 5. Illust. 6. § 8. Illust. 4, 6.

§ 38.

To believe the possibility of a supernatural agency of God in the world, is important in reference to prayer.

We must admit, that God can exert a supernatural influence on the course of things in the world, or we cannot discharge the duty of prayer (1) with perseverance and without any discouraging reflections. For, although prayer is prescribed for the benefit of men (2), and not for the sake of God (Matth. 6: 8); still even the moral benefit of prayer (3) cannot be attained by us, unless we pray with earnestness and fervour. But this fervour in prayer will unavoidably subside (4), unless we are convinced that God now regards our prayers, or that he did regard them in the primitive construction of the world (5). Now, no firm conviction of this kind will be possible, if we suppose, what cannot be proved, either that God cannot any longer exert an influence on the created world, or that he very rarely does so, and only in case he finds miracles necessary (§ 36, 37. Illust. 1). For, as the natural course of things in the world very much depends on the free actions of beings (§ 35. Illust. 4) who are neither acquainted with our circumstances nor concerned about them; as it depends on the agency of beings whose actions God has determined to leave free, and not to confine by irresistible laws (§ 35. Illust. 2); our prayers would constantly be disturbed by the apprehension, that the course of nature might not coincide with our wishes or subserve our interest; and our hope, that God himself would aid us, would ever be a doubtful one; inasmuch as he would be bound by an immutable law not to change

the natural course of things, even in those cases where it militated against our interest and our wishes (James 1: 6). If it were the first and supreme object of God, even at the time of creation, to leave the created world to its own course; we should have reason to fear, that this fixed purpose of his would not suffer him to regard our prayers and provide for our happiness. But if God can act freely, and to any extent, in and upon the created world (6); then we may confidently hope that, in every instance, let the natural course of things be what it may, God will not suffer any thing to befal us (7), but what is, according to his infallible judgment, best calculated to promote our interest, nothing but what will correspond with the desires uttered to him in our prayers, or at least with the purport of such prayers as are well pleasing in his sight (8).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Luke 18: 1—8. Ps. 50: 15. Philip. 4: 6. comp. Rom. 15: 30—32.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Compare the Programm of Nitzsch, (at Wittenberg,) on the Manner in which Jesus enforced the duty of prayer, p. 13, 38.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The advantages of prayer.

Michaelis, in his System of practical divinity (Pt. I. p. 222), specifies the following benefits of prayer: "It imparts a sensible form (a visible reality) to our abstract and theoretical faith, and thus renders it a better shield against the assaults of vice, which comes armed with the powers of sense:—It renders us familiar with things invisible:—It makes us recollect the invisible God, more frequently, amid our ordinary avocations:—It makes us afraid of transgressing the divine laws, and causes

shame before God for our past sins :—And, lastly, it awakens a lively feeling of gratitude to God." Nitzsch, in his programm (p. 8), remarks thus: "The desire of divine aid, which is brought into action in prayer, awakens in us a more vivid idea of God and of his attributes, and especially it excites a feeling of our dependance on him, as our Lord and Judge, and as the Author of our happiness; and thus in many respects contributes to improve our hearts and spread tranquillity through our souls."

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The ground of earnestness in prayer.

Nitzsch, in the above cited programm (p. 37 &c.), remarks: "If, agreeably to the purpose of God, prayer is nothing more than a religious exercise for the promotion of practical piety; still, as he commands us to pray to him, he must wish us to believe that he regards our prayers. For, the fervour of our prayer would necessarily and instantly subside, if whilst we were engaged in earnest supplication, the thought should arise, "God does indeed command me to pray, but this prayer will not secure to me a single blessing which he would not have given me without it."

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Luke 11: 8, 9, *αιτειτε, και δοθησεται ὑμιν* ask and it shall be given to you. 1 Pet. 3: 12, *τα ωτα κυριου εις δεησιν δικαιων* the ears of the Lord are attentive to the prayer of the righteous. compare Psalm 24 : 16, 18. 145 : 18 &c, קָרוֹב יְהוָה לְכָל־קֹרְאָיו Jehovah is near to all who call upon him.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Mark 14: 36, *αββα ὁ πατηρ, παντα δυνατα σοι* Abba, Father, all things are possible to thee. Ps. 86: 6—10.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Rom. 8: 28 &c, *τοις αγαπωσι τον θεον, παντα συνεργει εις*

το αγαθον to those who love God, all things work together for good. v. 31 &c. 1 Pet. 5: 7. Heb. 13: 5, 6.

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The proper nature of prayer.

The nature of that confidence in God which we are to manifest in our prayers, requires that we should regard God's views and designs as the wisest and best, and that our prayers for all those things which it is lawful for us to ask of God, such as the supply of our bodily necessities,[1] but which have no necessary influence on our moral improvement,[2] should never be absolute and unconditional; but we should pray that God would bestow them, if in his wisdom he sees them to be good for us;[3] for often the things which we desire as blessings, would, if bestowed, prove a curse.[4] "Germanus[5] Christi discipulus in eo genere precationis, quo certa hujus vitae commoda expetit, mala deprecatur, ipsi Deo, quod sibi conveniat decernendum relinquet; ea vero bona, quorum nobis spem certam fecit Christus, (e. g. πνευμα ἁγιον Luke 11: 13,) ita Deum rogabit ut nihil intermittat eorum, quae ab ipso fieri oporteat ad impetrandum auxilium divinum."[6] Very different was the case with those who wrought miracles, and whose prayers were followed by the extraordinary events which they expected.[7] For in them God himself ex-

---

1 Matth. 6: 11. 24: 20. Phil. 4: 6. 1 Pet. 5: 7. 2 Luke 11: 13.

3 Matth. 26: 39. Gen. 1: 10. 15: 32.

4 2 Cor. 12: 8. compare Michaelis' Dogmat. p. 668.

5 Nitzsch, Programm, p. 48.

6 [i. e. A genuine disciple of Christ, when supplicating for particular temporal blessings, or praying to be shielded from temporal evils, will leave it to God to decide what things are best for him; but when praying for such blessings as Christ has assured us will be granted, (e. g. the Holy Spirit, Luke 11: 13,) he will so pray as not to neglect any means necessary for obtaining the divine assistance. S.]

7 John 11: 42. 14: 12—14 (comp. Dissert. II, in libros N. T. historicos, p. 54. Opusc. Acad. Vol. III. p. 153). Acts 8: 15—17. 28: 8. 9: 40 (compare James 5: 15 &c.).

cited the assurance (*πιστιν*[1]), that precisely those miracles for which they prayed, were agreeable to his will. *Πιστις* in this passage, signifies an antecedent conviction that an extraordinary occurrence, which was yet invisible and only anticipated, would actually take place, when desired or prayed for by the worker of miracles. *Πιστις* expresses the generic idea, including *χαρισματα ἰαματων* gifts of healing, and *ενεργηματα δυναμεων* the exercise of miraculous powers v. 9, 10.[2] But this special assurance (*πιστις*), which those who wrought miracles must have possessed, if the extraordinary effects produced by them are to be regarded as real miracles (§ 36. Illust. 3), is not given to us. Nor is it necessary it should be; for, the general belief of a divine providence which takes charge of all our interests and necessities, is amply sufficient for us.[3]

Note on this paragraph.

In the annunciation of his "Elementary Course &c," given by the author, in the Tübing. gel. Anz. (sup. cit.), is the following further exposition of his views: "the author does not believe, that his view of the doctrine of divine providence tends to encourage the expectations of those who regard the faith of miracles as continuing through every age of the church, and as being attainable at any time by real christians.—If we are convinced, that God is not confined to the ordinary course of nature (§ 35, 36. Illust. 1), that whenever it is necessary to the

---

1 Mark 11: 22—24. 1 Cor. 12: 9.

2 "On others, the same Spirit bestows faith; some are taught by the same Spirit, to perform miraculous cures, and others, to perform other miracles." To the other spiritual gifts mentioned in this chapter, *λογος σοφιας, γνωσεως, προφητεια, γενη γλωσσων*, this *πιστις* was not required; for the individual was already conscious of the possession of these gifts, at the time of using them. This explanation of *πιστις*, is found in the Neuem Repert. Vol. III. p. 322. See in this connexion, Matth. 17: 20. 21: 21.

3 See Tübing. gel. Anzeig. for 1793, p. 372 &c.

attainment of his purpose, he can exert his personal agency for its accomplishment (§ 37), and is never obliged to sacrifice our best interests to the immutability of nature's laws (§ 38); then we can with the greater propriety regard every event which God suffers to occur in the natural course of things, as accordant with his benevolent intentions (§ 39). Hence, as we admit that God can interfere with the course of nature, we shall be the more contented with the course of nature as it is, and feel less need of the extraordinary interposition of God. For, the composure of our minds does not require an actual change in the course of things in every particular instance, but only the possibility of such change (§ 37), and an expectation that such change will be made, whenever a case shall occur in which our interest shall, in the judgment of God, render such change necessary. But, to undertake to determine the particular cases in which such interference is necessary, would be laying claim to the possession of the faith of miracles. Whoever confides in the omnipotent and omniscient God of love, as one that has all things under his controul, will act, in every instance, agreeably to his best judgment and abilities (§ 40); for he knows that such a dutiful course of conduct is agreeable to the divine will; and he is assured, that if the interference of God with the course of nature should at any time be necessary, God does not stand in need of our wisdom to point it out to him, or of our cooperation to enable him to effect it."

God is not bound to sacrifice any he chooses to accomplish, to the immutability of natures laws -

§ 39.

Every thing takes place according to the will and the purposes of God:—an inference from the preceding paragraphs.

If God can at any instant interfere with the course of nature (§ 37, 38), it necessarily follows, that all things take place in accordance with his pleasure. For, as nothing can occur without his knowledge (1) and foresight of it (§ 22) (2), and as God is not bound to leave all events to their natural course; it is evident, that whatever he leaves to the course of nature, not choosing to interfere in the case, takes place, not merely because such is the course of nature, but because the Regent of the course of nature found this event to be in accordance with his wise and benevolent purposes (3); for, otherwise he would have interfered, in a supernatural manner, with the operation of natural causes (4). With the utmost propriety, then, we acknowledge a design and a providence (5) of God, in every event which transpires in the world, even when we can discover no traces of a particular divine agency (6).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

See Ps. 139: 16. Acts 11: 28. 20: 23. 21: 11. and other passages.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The omniscience of God.

Matth. 10: 29, *ἐν στρουθιον ου πεσειται επι την γην, ανευ του πατρος ὑμων* not a sparrow falleth to the ground without your Father (see also Luke 12: 16. Ps. 139: 1—15). *Ανευ του πατρος ὑμων* is rendered by Kypke, " inscio et invito Patre

vestro" without the knowledge and consent of your Father. This signification of *ανευ*, he proves by several passages from profane writers.[1] Josephus[2] uses in the same sense, the expression *διχα θεου* absque Deo, without God; and in the same passage, he uses the phrase *διχα των επιτροπων*, which he himself explains thus, "*μη των επιμελητων προσταξαντων* without a direction (*or* command) from the inspectors."

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Thus, for example, the elder James was killed by Herod (Acts 12: 2); but not contrary to the will of God [*ανευ θεου*]. For, if the execution of this apostle had not accorded with the designs of God, he could as easily have prevented it, as prevent the execution of Peter, which he did at the same time and under similar circumstances (v. 6 &c.).

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The object of God in the permission of physical and moral evil, is benevolent and wise.

God has wise and benevolent objects in view, not only in the difficulties and afflictions which befal us in this life, that is, in the physical evil (§ 23); but also in the permission of moral evil. For, as rational and free moral agents are the most noble and the principal creatures in the universe, and as freedom in rational creatures who are not absolutely perfect,[3] necessarily implies ability to sin; both the perfection of the best possible world and the wisdom and goodness of God require, that beings should exist who are capable of sinning. The objection, "that if we suppose God permitted evil, we shall make him a coworker with evil doers, since permitting it in an absolutely dependent being, is little better than being a coworker with him," is

---

[1] See also Schleusner's Lex. in Nov. Test.

[2] De bell. Jud. Lib. II. c. 8. § 6.

[3] Job 15: 15. 4: 18.

thus answered by Süskind :[1] "This objection possesses no force, unless it can be proved that God could have prevented the evil in dependent creatures, without detriment to the highest good; or that God permitted the evil for the same reason as the good, namely, because it was pleasing to him, i. e. that he permitted evil to exist, for its own sake. But neither of these suppositions is admitted in the usual view of this subject; for, ability to sin is considered in the common system, as an indispensable condition of the existence of morality and freedom."— Actual transgression God prevents only by moral means; by various *motives* he endeavours to bring his free creatures to abhor the evil and love that which is good. See Gen. 2: 16. 3: 3. Rom. 2: 14. 1 32. Luke 16: 29 &c. Matth. 11: 20. John 15: 22—24. In these passages, the physical evil which is connected with moral evil, and the menaces of conscience, and the revelation contained in Scripture, and miracles, are mentioned as the means by which God endeavours to excite a hatred of evil and a love of virtue. If men form sinful resolutions, God can render their execution impossible; and by his special agency, if the operation of natural causes is insufficient, frustrate their immoral purposes. This may be exemplified by the liberation of Peter, through the instrumentality of an angel (Acts 12 : 6 &c.); the withering of Jeroboam's hand, when he extended it against a prophet (1 K. 13: 4 &c.); the transportation of Jesus to Egypt by a divine command to Joseph (Matth. 2: 13); by the preservation of Paul from being murdered, through the intervention of the Roman captain of the band who heard the noise (Acts 21: 31); and on another occasion, by his being apprised of their murderous intention by his nephew (Acts 22 : 16). But the wicked intention remains the same, although prevented from going into execution by an external power. Beings possessed of

[1] Mag. für christliche Dog. und Moral, St. 17. S. 161 &c.

moral agency, are generally not rendered either better or happier by the obstacles which prevent the execution of their plans. And if every sinful undertaking were hindered, and all wicked actions rendered impossible, by an external force; the consequence would be, that rational agents would lose their freedom, and with it their dignity and happiness. On the other hand, criminal actions, which are actually perpetrated, may be followed by effects very different from what their wicked agents expected,[1] and may advance the purposes of a wise God.[2] For these reasons, God very frequently does not interpose and prevent moral evil. But the object for which God permits sin, is very different from the sinful guilty object of those who commit it; for the wicked are punished for their crimes, even when they promote the accomplishment of the divine purposes.[3] The object of God is always and exclusively good and benevolent. Thus Joseph says (Gen. 50: 20), אַתֶּם חְשַׁבְתֶּם עָלַי רָעָה אֱלֹהִים חְשָׁבָהּ לְטֹבָה ye devised evil against me, but God designed it for good. Acts 3: 14—18.[4] The following remark is of no small importance in the explanation of the Old and New Testaments; and though it has in later times been occasionally controverted, it has not been overthrown: "If a person renders it possible for another to perform a certain action, or does not prevent his performing it, that action is called the action of the person permitting it." Thus in Ex. 7: 3, it is said of God, that he hardened Pharaoh's heart, because he (even by the preservation of his

---

1 Is. 10: 7 &c. 1 Cor. 2: 8.

2 Is. 10: 5, 12, 15. Luke 22: 37, *δει τελεσθηναι εν εμοι το· "και μετα ανομων ελογισθη."* Acts 4: 27, 28.

3 Is. 10: 5, 12 &c. Matth. 21: 38 &c. 22: 6. 1 Thess. 2: 15, 16.

4 Compare Observv. ad analogiam et syntaxin Ebraicam, p. 28. Jacobi's Reflections on the wise purposes of God, No. VII, Pt. I. p. 280 &c. Griesbach's Introduction to the study of popular Dogmatics, § 80. De Marees' Vindication of God in the permission of moral evil, Vol. II. p. 208 &c. Reinhard's Lectures on doctrinal theology, p. 267.

When God gives ability, and permits a thing; it is often said that he does it.

life) rendered it possible for him to manifest such perverseness. It would therefore be very unjust to accuse the writers of the O. Testament, who certainly had more worthy ideas of God, of the gross error of making God the author of wicked actions—an error which, it is pretended, has been corrected only since the Babylonian captivity, by introducing among the Jews the belief of a devil. Even Paul uses the expression *πεμψει αυτοις ὁ θεος ενεργειαν πλανης* God shall send upon them the powerful influence of delusion; although he had immediately before in v. 9, 10, attributed this *ενεργεια*, or influence, to Satan." 2 Thess. 2: 11.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The belief of a divine providence in general, is sufficient to tranquillize a mind filled with reverence for the wisdom and goodness of God (1 Pet. 6: 7), even if his designs in numerous instances cannot be ascertained (§ 22. Illust. 1). But we must be particularly careful, on the one hand, not to be elated by prosperity, as though it were a certain evidence of our excellence; for frequently God sends us prosperity in order to lead us to repentance;[1] and if this object be not attained,[2] we may soon experience a sad reverse. And on the other hand, we must feel ourselves under sacred obligation, not to suffer our own afflictions to impair our confidence in the goodness of God, nor to regard the misfortunes of others as evidence of the sinfulness of their thoughts and actions.[3] For, as God, under whose wise providence afflictions come on men, may have very different objects in view in them, every such judgment must be uncharitable, and very often false. Job 42: 7, 8. John 9: 2, 3. Matth. 5: 11, 12. 1 Cor. 4: 9—13.

---

[1] *μετανοιαν* Luke 13: 8. Rom. 2: 4.

[2] Rom. 2: 5. Luke 13: 3, 5. 16: 25.

[3] Luke 13: 2—5.

Our prosperity, or adversity is no rule for us to judge of our moral worth.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

It is evident that God has some design in those occurrences which are produced by the operation of natural causes. This is proved by those occurrences while predicting which God declared expressly the end that he would accomplish by them, but which nevertheless seem to have been effected by mere human agency. Amos 3: 6, 7, 2, אִם־תִּהְיֶה רָעָה בְּעִיר וַיהוָה לֹא עָשָׂה shall there be an evil, and the Lord hath not done it? Is. 10: 5, 12, 15 (comp. v. 7). Luke 19: 42—44. 11: 49—51. 21: 22. Matth. 20: 28 (compare Matth. 17: 12). See Köppen's "The Bible a work of divine wisdom," Vol. I. p. 268 &c.

§ 40.

A sincere confidence in the unbounded power and agency of God in the world, leads to no injurious results.

Such a confidence in the providence of God, affords no encouragement either to indolence or presumption. For, this confidence takes it for a conceded fact (§ 39), that God exerts no extraordinary agency, excepting when the ordinary course of nature does not harmonize with his purposes. But we cannot determine what the divine purposes are (§ 22. Illust. 1); yet this we certainly know, that indolence (1) and presumption (2) are displeasing to God (3); and we have no reason to expect, that God will exert an extraordinary influence to counteract the consequences of these sins (4).

It seems that a God has
a wise and holy design in every
thing that takes place; whether

ILLUSTRATION 1.

1 Thess. 4: 11, *πρασσειν τα ιδια, και εργαζεσθαι ταις ιδιαις χερσιν* to transact your own business, and to work with your own hands. 2 Thess. 3: 6 &c. Luke 16: 10—12. Matth. 25: 26.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

Matth. 4: 5—7, *ουκ εκπειρασεις κυριον τον θεον σου* thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

Although Paul, in his voyage to Italy (Acts ch. 27), had received a divine assurance of the happy result of the perils of the ship's company (v. 23, 25), still he did not neglect to employ human assistance and precaution (v. 31, 34). Though convinced that it was the intention of God to save the persons in the ship, he was also persuaded that human prudence and exertion must cooperate for the accomplishment of the end.

ILLUSTRATION 4.

See Prov. 6: 9—11. 24: 30 &c. 13: 4, 5.

§ 41.

Conclusion.

As the providence of God in the affairs of men, has been manifested in an arrangement of a very peculiar nature, an arrangement deserving of our highest regard, as well on account of its intrinsic nature as of its reference to *us*; it is necessary that this arrangement (for our salvation through Christ) should be considered more specifically and at large.

This shall be done in the second chapter of the third book, and in the fourth book. But as this same arrangement has given us some new views of *God himself*, and has also cast some new light on the subject of Creation and Providence, discussed in this second book; it is necessary to add a supplement to it, which is contained in the following Third Part.

PART III.

OF GOD, AS FATHER, SON, AND HOLY GHOST.

§ 42.

Christ is GOD, *and is called* GOD *in the highest sense.*

Christ, the Being through whose instrumentality (§ 6—8, 65, 4 &c.) God accomplishes the purposes of his special providence over man (§ 41), is represented to us as not being a mere man (1); for to him the Scriptures ascribe an existence before his human birth (2), and even prior to the beginning of the world (3): in short, they attribute to him an *eternal* (4) existence. Nor can it be deemed strange, that this divine attribute (5), as well as other perfections of God (6), together with that adoration (7) which results from them, and which can properly belong only to the divine Being (8), should be ascribed to Christ; inasmuch as even the Scriptural representation of the true God (§ 20, 33), is also transferred to him (9). And hence we may easily determine, in what sense (10) the name God (11) is applied to him (12).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

Evidence of the twofold nature of Christ.

The fact that Christ possesses another nature, in addition to the σαρξ[1] *or* human nature, is proved by the following passages: John 6: 62, *εαν ουν θεωρητε τον υἱον του ανθρωπου αναβαινοντα ὁπου ην το προτερον;* what if ye should see the Son of

---

[1] Rom. 1: 3. 9: 5.

man ascending thither where he was before? 16: 28, *εξηλθον παρα του πατρος, και εληλυθα εις τον κοσμον· παλιν αφιημι τον κοσμον, και πορευομαι προς τον πατερα* I departed from the Father and came into the world; again, I leave the world, and go to the Father. 8: 14, Jesus answered and said unto them, Though I bear record of myself, my record is true; for I know whence I came and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I came and whither I go. 3: 11, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak what we know, and testify that which we have seen; and ye receive not our testimony. v. 4, For none ascendeth into heaven, but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man, who is in heaven [whose abode is in heaven].[1] 6: 46, Not that any man hath seen the Father, except him who is from God; he hath seen the Father. v. 33, For the bread of God is that (*ὁ—αρτος*) which descendeth from heaven and giveth life to the world. v. 38, For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me; comp. v. 50 &c. 8: 23, And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; *εγω εκ των ανω ειμι* I am from above. 1 Cor. 15: 47—49, The first man is made of earth, and is earthy; but the Second Man is *κυριος εξ ουρανου* the Lord who came from heaven.[2]

The passage 1 Tim. 3: 16, (Great unquestionably is the mystery of godliness [the divine secret], God was manifested in the flesh &c.), even on the supposition that *ὁ ς*, and not *θ ε ο ς*, is the true reading; proves at least, that there was in Christ a nature different from that feeble human nature in which he ap-

1 Compare, on this passage, Süskind's work, entitled, "In what sense did Jesus assert the divinity of his doctrinal and practical religious instructions?" Tübingen, 1802, p. 202—214. and Kuinöl, Comment. in Evang. Johann. ad 3: 13. See also v. 31.

2 See Heb. 12: 15. and compare Doederlein, de formula, "Christum coelo venisse," Opusc. theol. p. 63.

peared.[1] In the Programm, referred to in the margin, reasons are assigned, to prove that the sense of this text will be the same, whether ὁς or θεος be the true reading; and the words ὁς εφανερωθη εν σαρκι are explained thus: "The words ὁς — δοξη, might easily be so construed, that the first clause ὁς εφανερωθη εν σαρκι should be the subject, and all the subsequent propositions, predicates. But in this case, the inspired writer would have said, ὁ εφανερωθεις εν σαρκι, in order to distinguish the subject from the several predicates which follow. It is, therefore, better to refer ὁς to the preceding word μυστηριον, and to translate (per synesin) thus: "The great secret, the subject of which &c. (cujus objectum, materies); i. e. the person who was the subject of this great secret &c." In 1 Tim. 6: 10, φιλαργυρια, ἡς (cujus objectum, sive materies), and in Col. 1:27, ὁς εστι Χριστος, the relative pronoun ὁς has the same signification, as we give it here by referring ὁς to μυστεριον immediately preceding. Agreeably to this explanation of ὁς, the words ὁς—σαρκι presuppose a higher invisible nature of Christ; or they must be understood thus: "A higher being which was united with Christ, made his appearance as a man." For if Paul had merely intended to say, "He (the *man* Jesus) appeared as a weak man;" then the φανερωσις εν σαρκι of Christ, on the supposition of his having been a mere man, was something so perfectly natural, that it [his appearance] could not be represented as being μεγα μυστηριον a great mystery, or any part of one. This is corroborated by the following words: εδικαιωθη εν πνευματι, when explained thus: "the professions of Jesus relative to his superior dignity, which seemed to be inconsistent with his appearance in frail human nature, were proved true (justified, confirmed), by his subsequent glorious happiness, πμευμα—ανα-

1 See the Programm on 1 Tim. 3: 16, Tübing. 1788, in Velthusen, Kuinöl and Ruperti's Comment. Theol. Vol. I. No. VII.

ληφθη εν δοξη." If Paul referred, in these words, to another and a higher nature of Christ, distinct from the *man* Jesus; it was the same nature which he ascribes to Christ in other passages, namely, a divine nature, in the highest sense of the word.[1]

The twofold nature of Christ, is also proved by the fact, that he is often distinguished from men. Gal. 1:1, 10—12, An apostle, not by *man*, but by Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. 7 : 22 &c, If any one who is a servant, is called of the Lord [converted to christianity], he is made free by the Lord [he enjoys the liberty of the children of God]; and, in like manner, if a free man is called [converted], he becomes the servant of Christ &c. Eph. 6: 6 &c, Not with eyeservice as pleasing men, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God with sincerity of heart. Col. 3: 23 &c, And whatsoever ye do, do it from the heart, as to the Lord, and not unto men:—for ye serve the Lord Christ. Heb. 7 : 28, For the law makes feeble *men* highpriests; but the declaration, which has been made since the law, and which was confirmed by an oath (Ps. 110 : 4), makes *the Son* Highpriest, who is raised forever into glory.

See the Dissertation of Dionys. van de Wijnpersse, entitled, "A vindication of the true and eternal divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, against the more recent objections to it," which is found in the work of the society at the Hague, For the defence of the christian religion (1792). This dissertation proves in the happiest manner, how utterly inconsistent with the whole spirit of the New Testament, is the supposition that Christ was a mere man; and how perfectly that spirit harmonizes with the doctrine maintained in this paragraph (§ 42).

---

1 See, on the various readings and explanations of this passage, Griesbach's Nov. Test. 2d ed. 1806, Vol. II. p. 428—432. Heinrich's Pauli Epp. ad Tim. Tit. et Philemonem, perpetua annotatione illustratae, edit. Koppiana, Vol. VII. p. 101—119. and Wegscheider's First Ep. of Paul to Timothy, Götting. 1810, p. 122—129.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The existence of Christ, before his appearance in the flesh.

Proof of this is found in the two following passages of John's Gospel :

I. John 8: 58, *Αμην, αμην, λεγω ὑμιν· πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι, ειμι* verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.[1]

The following translation of this passage, is given in the works referred to : "Before Abraham was, I existed." Wetstein (on John 8 : 58) does indeed observe, "Desidero locum Scripturae, ubi *εγω ειμι* significat, *ego eram* (I existed), vel *ego sum* simpliciter;" but there is no necessity for such a passage, if it can only be proved that *ειναι* has the signification *to exist;* and this it certainly has in John 17 : 5 ; as also its participle *οντα* in Rom. 4: 17. This translation is vindicated against the explanations of the Socinians and others, (who supply to *ειμι*, either *Χριστος* or some other predicate consisting of a word or proposition,) on the following grounds :

1. Agreeably to the idiom of the Hebrew, and also of the Evangelist John, the present *ειμι* may be used instead of the imperfect *ην*, see 1 John 3 : 7. 2: 29. 4 : 17. This, says Bengel,[2] is particularly the case, when that which is affirmed *to have been*, still continues *to be ;* and thus the sense of both the present and preterite is comprehended in the present ; as in John 15: 27, *εστε*. Jer. 1: 5 (LXX), *επισταμαι σε*.

2. The explanation, "Before Abraham was, I was appointed to be the Messiah," (which is adopted by Löfler, in the German version of Souverain's Essay on the Platonism of the Fa-

[1] See on this passage, the work "on the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 425 &c. and Dissert. III, in libror. N. T. histor. aliquot loca, p. 50—55. Opusc. Acad. Vol. III. p 247—252.

[2] Gnomon, in Johann. 8: 58.

thers of the church p. 385, and in Eichhorn's Bibl. VII. p. 1027) is certainly not founded on the words *εγω ειμι*. The phrase *ὁ Χριστος*, or *ὁ ερχομενος*, if supplied to *ειμι*, should stand immediately before it, and in the context, as it does in ch. 4: 26; but this is not the case here. So Ziegler, in illustrating this passage,[1] says: "The explanation, 'I was appointed to be the Messiah,' is unsupported by a satisfactory proof of such an idiom; and consequently this passage itself cannot be used as such a proof."

3. Another explanation, (given in the Allgem. Litter. Zeitung,) is this:[2] "Before Abraham was born, I am he, at whose day he sincerely rejoiced, i. e. I am the Messiah." To this view of the text, the following objections present themselves: (a) Christ would, on this supposition, merely repeat (in v. 58) what he had previously said (v. 56), in the words *Αβρααμ ηγαλλιασατο, ινα ιδη την ημεραν την εμην*. For, the assertion *εγω ειμι* or "I am he," at whose day Abraham rejoiced, is already contained in *εμην*. — (b) The words *πριν Αβρααμ γενεσθαι*, would not only be superfluous, but would appear unnatural, if Jesus had intended by the words "I am he to see whose day Abraham rejoiced," to represent himself simply as the Messiah; and this without regarding the question of the Jews (v. 57), but passing it by altogether, as unworthy of notice. — (c) Nothing which can suitably be supplied to *εγω ειμι*, can be taken from the remote 56th verse, but must be derived from the 57th verse which immediately precedes it; so that the sense would be, *εγω ειμι, ὁς εωρακε τον Αβρααμ*, i. e. "I am he that knew Abraham, before he was born."—(d) Agreeably to the version, "Before Abraham was, I existed," the passage contains the

1 See Henke's Magaz. für Religionsphilosophie, B. V. St. 2. S. 262.

2 Jahrg. 1793, No. 295, 296. comp. Paulus' Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 461 &c.

proof requisite to support the assertion, that Jesus is *greater* than Abraham (v. 53). This proof lies in his preexistence; and Jesus took occasion from the question of the Jews (v. 57), to appeal to this evidence of the dignity of his person.[1]

II. John 1: 15, *Ὁ οπισω μου ερχομενος, εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν· ὁτι πρωτος μου ην* he that cometh after me, is preferred to me, for he was before me.[2]

In the work referred to in the margin, the following version is given of this passage: "He that cometh after me, goes before me [is greater than I, v. 27, *οὐ—ὑποδηματος*. Matth. 3: 11, *ισχυροτερος μου εστιν*. John 3: 30, *επανω παντων εστι*]; for he existed before I did." And the remark is added, "that the Evangelist probably adduces this declaration of the Baptist, in opposition to the objection which was advanced against christianity, at least by the later disciples (§ 16) of John: that the doctrines of the Baptist are older than those of Christ. Ewald remarks,[3] that if both expressions, *εμπροσθεν μου γεγονεν* and *πρωτος μου ην*, are referred to any other precedency than *priority of time*, there would be a tautology. And Kuinöl subjoins the additional remark, that *εμπροσθεν* is never used to express precedency in dignity or respectability, either in the New Testament or the LXX, or in the profane authors. To the explanation of these words given by Bolten, who refers them to an earlier residence of Jesus near the Jordan; Paulus justly objects, (a) that it should then read, *πρωτος μου ὡδε ην*, or *παρην*, he was here before me, or he was there before me:— and (b) that agreeably to Matth. 3: 13, Jesus was just come from Galilee, to be baptized.

---

1 Comp. on John 8: 56, 58. Ewald, on the Dignity of Jesus and its Influence on his ethical system, Hanover, 1798, p. 40—50. Kuinöl, Evang. Johannis illustratum, in loc. and Schott's Epitome theologiae christianae dogmaticae, 104 &c.

2 See the work "On the object of John, p. 5 &c.

3 Ewald, sup. cit. p. 57.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The antemundane existence of Christ.

That Christ existed prior to the beginning of the world, is evident from the following texts:

I. John 1: 1, *Εν αρχη ην ὁ λογος* in the beginning was the word; comp. v. 3.

In the work "on the Object of the Gospel of John," the version of the words *εν αρχη* "in the beginning of the world," is vindicated against the Socinian translation, "in the beginning of the Gospel." The grounds of the defence are the following: 1. The position, that the words *εν αρχη*, when standing alone, can signify "in the beginning of the Gospel," is altogether unsupported by evidence. In Mark 1: 1, we find the words *εν αρχη του ευαγγελιου*, but not *αρχη* alone. —2. It is evident from the third verse, that *all created things* must be conceived as not existing previously to this *αρχη* or *beginning*. See infra, Illust. 9. I.

II. John 17: 5, 24, *Δοξα, ἡ ειχον προ του τον κοσμον ειναι, παρα σοι·—την δοξαν την εμην, ἡν εδωκας μοι, ὁτι ηγαπησας με προ καταβολης κοσμου* the glory which I had with thee before the world was:—my glory, which thou gavest me, because thou lovedst me before the formation of the world.

The following explanation of this passage, is given in the work "on the Object of the Gospel of John:"[1] "the glory which thou gavest [art about to give] me, because thou (as I was with thee before the world was) didst love me before the world was formed." — In opposition to another exposition, (which renders the words in v. 24 and 5, *δοξα ἡν εδωκας μοι*, and *ἡ ειχον παρα σοι*, thus: "the glory which thou didst appoint for me or which I had agreeably to thine eternal appointment,") the former version is supported by the following arguments: 1. In other pas-

[1] § 86. p. 427 &c.

sages, Jesus combines together, his going to the Father when he leaves the world, and his existence with him before he appeared on earth. John 3: 13. 6: 62. 16 : 28. — 2. St. John himself seems to favour the former explanation. Compare John 1 : 2, *ουτος ην εν αρχη προς τον θεον*, and 1 John 1 : 2, *η ζωη η αιωνιος, ητις ην προς τον πατερα*, with the words *η ειχον παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον ειναι*, this was in the beginning with God—that eternal life which was with the Father —which I had with thee before the world was.[1] That *εχειν* can signify, "to have any thing in purpose," which is maintained by Grotius and Wetstein, is denied by Ewald.[2] By similar phraseology, the existence of Christ before the formation of the world, is expressed in Col. 1 : 17, *και αυτος εστι προ παντων* "therefore (because he is the Creator of all things v. 16) he also existed before all."[3]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

The eternity of Christ.

That Jesus existed from eternity, is distinctly taught, in 1 John 1: 2, *την ζωην την αιωνιον, ητις ην προς τον πατερα, και εφανερωθη ημιν* (we bear witness, and show unto you) *that eternal life*,[4] which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us. Compare with this, Heb. 1: 10—12, thou Lord (Christ, v. 1—10) in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth,

1 See on this passage, Mori Epitome theol. christianae, p. 61. note 2.

2 Sup. cit. p. 54. Comp. the same author's Religionslehren der Bibel, B. 2. S. 45—48. C. C. Flatt's Symbb. ad illustranda graviora quaedam Jesu dicta in Evangelio Johannis, Pt. II. p. 5—9. In Note 8 of Ewald's work sup. cit. that writer maintains, that the above version of the words *εχειν παρα θεῳ*, finds no support either in the passages of the New Testament quoted by its friends, or in the Rabbinical writings. See also Kuinöl, on John 17: 5. Schott, l. c. p. 105.

3 See Dissert. I, in Coloss. Note 28. Opusc. Acad. Vol. II. p. 133.

4 See the work, "on the Object of the Gospel of John," p. 385 &c.

and the heavens are the work of thy hands; they shall be destroyed, but thou shalt continue to exist, and they shall all grow old as a garment. Rev. 22: 13, *εγω το Α και το Ω, πρωτος και εσχατος* I am the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last.

In the New Apology for the Revelation,[1] it is stated that these words which are applied to Christ, manifestly contain a description of the true God, and represent him as the Author and End of the whole creation; for, in Rev. 21: 5, 6, God is described in similar terms: *εγω ειμι το Α και το Ω, ἡ αρχη και ὁ τελος.* The same idea is, in Rom. 11: 36, expressed thus: *δι' αυτου και εις αυτον τα παντα*, and in Heb. 2: 10, as follows: *δι' ὁν τα παντα, και δι οὐ τα παντα.* Michaelis indeed thinks it possible, that the words *εγω ειμι ὁ πρωτος και ὁ εσχατος*, in the two passages Rev. 1: 17. 2: 8, should signify, "I am the first whom thou didst know as a mortal, and the last whom now immortal, thou shalt again see; i. e. I am still the same whom thou hast known." And his reason is, that in both these passages, the resurrection of Jesus is spoken of immediately after. But in Rev. 22: 15, at least, there is no allusion to the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

1 John 5: 20, *ὁ αληθινος θεος και ἡ ζωη αιωνιος* the true God and eternal life. Rev. 21: 6. Is. 44: 6. 48: 12, אֲנִי רִאשׁוֹן אַף־אֲנִי אַחֲרוֹן I am the First and the Last. Compare § 29.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

Other divine attributes ascribed to Christ.

1. *Omnipotence*: Phil. 3: 21, *ενεργεια του δυνασθαι αυτον και ὑποταξει ἑαυτῳ τα παντα* the power by which also he is able to subdue all things to himself. Compare John 10: 28—30. In the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, the sense of this

[1] p. 381 &c. (Illust. 7. inf.) [2] Introd to N. T. 3d ed. d. 1352.

last passage is given thus: "As the Father is greater than all, so that no enemy can wrest those who are mine, out of *his* hands (v. 29); in like manner, nothing can wrest them out of *my* hands (v. 28); for I and the Father are one; we are so united, that the dominion and the omnipotent power of the Father are mine." The explanation of the words *ἐν ἐσμεν*, as signifying an *agreement* of the Son with the Father, in their views and feelings in regard to the improvement of the human family, is exposed to the following difficulties: (a) It is not proved, that *ἓν εἰναι* is frequently synonymous with *το αυτο φρονειν or* to be of one mind. Even in John 17: 11, *ἓν εἰναι* does not necessarily refer merely to oneness or similarity of views, but can very naturally include union in the enjoyment of the same privileges, hopes, and happiness. (b) The context of this passage (10: 28—30) leads us to the explanation above. For Jesus uses the same expressions in v. 29 and 28, "No one can wrest my sheep from the Father's hand — no one shall wrest them out of my hand." Both clauses must therefore be understood alike, and as the first is deduced from the power of the Father (*ὁ πατηρ μου μειζων παντων εστι* v. 29); so also must the latter, namely, the impossibility of wresting the sheep of Christ out of his hands, be grounded on the protecting power of Christ; and this is confirmed by the preceding words *κἀγω ζωην αιωνιον διδωμι αυτοις* I give them salvation.—John 10: 18, *εξουσιαν εχω θειναι αυτην (την ψυχην), και εξουσιαν εχω παλιν λαβειν αυτην* I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to resume it. In ch. 2: 19 he says, Destroy this temple, and I will build it again in three days; and in other passages, his resurrection is ascribed to *God*, e. g. Acts 2: 24, 32. 3: 13, 15. 5: 30. 1 Cor. 6: 14. 15: 15. Divine power [*θεια δυναμις*] is also ascribed to Christ, in 2 Pet. 1: 3. comp. v. 16 *δυναμις* and *μεγαλειοτης*. For, *αυτου* (v. 3) must refer to *Ιησου του κυριου ἡμων* (v. 2).

2. *Omniscience* is ascribed to Christ, in 1 Cor. 4: 5. Rev. 2: 23.—[Matth. 11: 27, "All things are delivered to me of my Father; and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.

If in this passage, the same *omniscience* be not ascribed to the Son as to the Father; I am unable to make out satisfactorily what the meaning of it is. In the latter clause of the verse, men are declared to be entirely dependent on the Son for that knowledge of the Father which is revealed; i. e. he only makes this revelation. John 1: 18, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten who dwelleth in the bosom of the Father, *he hath revealed him.*" At the same time I concede, it is *possible*, that the knowledge here spoken of, may be merely that which is intended to be revealed in the Gospel.

John 6: 46, "Because that no man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father." The word ἑωρακε here, does not mean *to see with bodily eyes*, but *with the mental eye*, i. e. to know. What but omniscience could be adequate to the knowledge here predicated of Christ? And is it a satisfactory explanation of the text to say, that the knowledge here meant, is simply that which is conveyed in the instructions of the Gospel?

In the same manner, the knowledge of the most intimate secrets of the human heart, is ascribed to Christ. John 2: 24, 25, "But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men; and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man." John 6: 64, "But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew who they were that believed not, and who should betray him."

Acts 1: 24, "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." That *Lord* (κυριος) here means *Christ*,

seems to me very plain from verses 21 and 22 (compare verse 6) of the context. Besides, this is the *common* appellation of the Saviour, in the Acts of the Apostles. The appeal made in this case, respects the *choice of an apostle*. "Shew, Lord," say the apostles, "which of these two THOU hast chosen; that he may take part of this ministry and *apostleship*." Is there any room to doubt, here, that the apostles did appeal to the same Lord who had chosen them, to designate who shall fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Judas?

1 Cor. 4: 4, 5, "For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me is the Lord. Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall every man have praise of God." That *Lord* (κυριος) here means Christ, is plain, both from the office of judging ascribed to him, and from his *coming* to judgment. Without citing numerous other passages, which confessedly represent Christ as the final Judge of all the human race; permit me here to ask, Is it possible for any being who is not *omniscient*, to judge the universe of intelligent creatures? Can he for thousands of years, (possibly of ages,) be present every where, and know what is transacted; can he penetrate the recesses of the human heart; can he remember the whole character and actions of countless myriads so diverse in talents, temper, circumstances, and situation;—and yet be finite? be neither *omnipresent* nor *omniscient*? God claims it as his distinguishing and peculiar prerogative, that he knows the secrets of the human heart (Jer. 17: 10); what then must he be, who knows the secrets of all hearts at all times, and in all worlds? If he be not God, the proof that the Father is God, is defective too; and we have the question again to dispute with the Manicheans, whether Jehovah be not a limited and imperfect being.

"But," you will say, "Christ acts as Judge by delegated authority: why not then, by knowledge imparted to him?" He does indeed *act* as Judge, by delegated authority, because it is in his mediatorial capacity that he acts as Judge; but to *act* as Judge is one thing, to be *qualified* for such an office is another. Exaltation as Mediator constitutes him Judge in that capacity; *omnipresence* and *omniscience only* can qualify him for the duties of that station. And can *omniscience* be *imparted?* We may as well say *omnipotence* or *self-existence* can be imparted. There is, and there can be but *one* God; and a second omniscient being, (omniscient simply by knowledge *imparted*,) would force us into all the absurdities of polytheism.

Rev. 2: 23, "And all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works." The same person speaks here, who "was dead and is alive," i. e. Christ (chap. 1: 18). The sense of the passage is too plain to need any comment.

To conclude this head: when I compare such passages as those above cited, with the description of divine omniscience, how can I doubt that the New Testament writers mean to ascribe the *knowledge of all things* to Christ? To say that whatsoever pertains to God or man, is known by any being, is to predicate omniscience of that being. Compare now with this, the knowledge which God ascribes to himself only, in Jer. 17: 9, 10, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it? I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings."[1]]

[1 See "Letters to the Rev. Wm. E. Channing &c." on the divinity of Christ, by Professor Stuart; from which the above paragraphs relative to the omniscience of Christ, are extracted. S.]

ILLUSTRATION 7.

Divine honour and worship are ascribed to Christ.

I. John 5: 23, *Ἱνα παντες τιμωσι τον υἱον, καθως τιμωσι τον πατερα* that all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father.

Even allowing that *καθως* would admit of such an explanation as would not imply a similar adoration of the Father and of Christ; still, in the passage before us, the context will not admit of such an exposition. Because (a) in v. 27—29, Christ ascribes divine works to himself; and in v. 21, an equality with the Father. — (b) As the Jews (v. 18) immediately preceding, had pronounced a declaration made by Jesus, to be blasphemy, and charged him with "making himself equal with God" *ισον ἑαυτον ποιει τῳ θεῳ*· Jesus would have been bound, by his reverence for God and love to his hearers, to avoid using an expression which could so naturally be understood as indicating divine worship; and it would have been his duty distinctly to declare, that he did not desire any thing of this kind.[1]

II. John 14: 1, 13, 14, *εαν τι αιτησητε εν τῳ ονοματι μου, εγω ποιησω* if ye ask any thing in my name, I will do it.

Jesus here directs the apostles to pray in a manner that will be to his honour (*εν ονοματι*, comp. § 43. Illust. 4), i. e. to pray with the confident expectation that *he* would grant their petition (v. 1). Through the Son, by his answering the prayers of his people, the glory of the Father was to be manifested, *ἱνα δοξασθη ὁ πατηρ εν τῳ υἱῳ* that the Father may be glorified in the Son; (v. 7—9. § 44. Illust. 9).

III. 1 Cor. 1: 2, *επικαλουμενοι το ονομα του κυριου ἡμων Ιησου Χριστου* who worship [call on the name of] our Lord Jesus Christ.[2] Acts 7: 59, *επικαλουμενον και λεγοντα· κυριε Ιη-*

[1] See the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 196—198. and Ewald, on the Dignity of Jesus, p. 123 &c.

[2] The explanation of this text, as signifying "who are called after the

σου (and they stoned Stephen) calling upon [Jesus] and saying: Lord Jesus, (receive my spirit). The first of the two passages here adduced as a proof of the divine honour due to Christ, is of divine authority, because it declares that an apostle (Paul) sanctions the worship of Christ; which he also confirmed by his own example, 2 Cor. 12 : 8. 1 Thess. 3: 11. 2 Thess. 2: 16, 17. Rom. 1: 7. 1 Cor. 1: 3. 2 Cor. 1: 2 &c. Eph. 3: 6. The second passage has divine authority, because it contains the expressions of Stephen, who, at least at that time, spoke by divine inspiration, πληρης πνευμανος ἁγιου v. 55. But both passages, even when considered as historical testimony, prove that in the apostolic age Christ was worshipped as God by all christian churches (1 Cor. 1: 2), and even by the churches in Palestine (Acts 9 : 21, 14), which at a later date abandoned the ancient faith.[1]

The well known passage in Pliny: "Carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem" (L.X. Ep. 97) they sing a hymn together to Christ as a God, refers to the churches situated in a province of Asia Minor. And as the Gospel of John had been published in the country from which Pliny wrote, and a short time before he wrote his epistle; the words "quasi Deo," are doubtless to be understood agreeably to John 1: 1, The Logos (*or* word) was God. Eusebius also (Hist. Ecc. V. 28), in opposing the followers of Artemon, appeals to ancient hymns of the christians, in which Christ is represented as God: "ψαλμοι δε ὁσοι και ὠδαι αδελφων απ᾽ αρχης ὑπο πιστων γραφεισαι, τον λογον του θεου, τον χριστον, ὑμνουσι θεολογουντες."[2] There is no example

name of Jesus Christ," is inconsistent with the passages hereafter to be considered: Acts 7: 59. Rom. 10: 9—13. also Acts 22: 16. See Krause's Epist. ad Corinthios, 1792, on 1 Cor. 1: 2.

1 See also, on the divine worship of Christ, Rom. 10: 9—14. Rev. 5 : 8 &c. and § 78.

2 The work from which Eusebius makes this quotation, was by some

known, of a christian church in the apostolic age which can be shown to have denied those personal excellencies of Jesus, which

regarded as the production of Caius; by others it was ascribed to Origen; and the third and most probable opinion is, that it was the work of an anonymous author, and the same in substance as that which Theodoret calls "the Little Labyrinth." The object of Eusebius in quoting this passage, was, to prove the opinion, that Christ is a mere man, to be of recent date, in opposition to its advocates, who maintained that it was even of apostolic origin; and as the whole context of Eusebius reflects light on the subject before us, I will translate it for the gratification of the reader. "The works of very many others have also reached us; whose names we cannot indeed specify, but they were orthodox and ecclesiastical [persons], as is proved by the interpretation given by each of them of the divine Scriptures; but they are unknown to us, because their names are not prefixed to their books. In an elaborate piece of one of these authors, composed against the heresy of Artemon, (which Paul of Samosata has attempted to revive in our age,) there is extant a narrative very relevant to the history we are composing. For, the author, in proving that the above named heresy, which makes the Saviour a mere man, was an innovation of recent date, (the propagators of it boasted of its antiquity;) after saying many other things in reprehension of their blasphemous lies, uses the following language: 'they assert that all the ancients and even the apostles themselves, believed and taught the same things which they now maintain; and that the preaching of the truth was preserved until the times of Victor, the thirteenth bishop of Rome from Peter; but that from the time of his successor Zephyrinus, the truth had been corrupted.' And this assertion of theirs might perhaps have been believed, were it not that they are contradicted, first by the divine Scriptures (*θειαι γραφαι*), and then by the writings of some brethren more ancient than the times of Victor, and which were composed in support of the truth against the gentiles, and against the heresies of those days. I refer to the works of Justin, Miltiades, Tatian, Clement, and many others, in all of which divinity is ascribed to Christ (*θεολογειται ὁ χριστος*). For, who is ignorant of the books of Irenaeus and Melito and of the rest, which declare Christ to be both God and man? Moreover, all the psalms and hymns of the brethren, *written from the beginning by the faithful, celebrate the praises of Christ, the Word of God, and attribute divinity to him.* How is it possible, then, that the ancients until the time of Victor, should have taught what they assert, when the opinion of the church through so many years is declared and known? And why are they not ashamed to assert such a falsehood concerning Victor; when they well know that it was Victor who excommunicated Theodotus the currier, the father and chief of this God-denying apostacy; for Theodotus was the first that declared Christ to be a mere man?" Euseb. Eccles. Hist. V. 27, 28, ed. Valesii, Amstd. 1695. The words above quoted in the text, are here printed in italics. S.]

John ascribes to him. The sects of the Ebionites and other Jewish christians in Palestine, who denied the deity and supernatural conception of Christ, or at least the former of these doctrines, probably took their rise after the second Jewish war, when one part of the Jewish christians separated from the others, and as we may suppose, attached themselves more closely to the unbelieving Jews.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 8.

That adoration belongs exclusively to God, is expressly taught in Is. 42: 8, כְּבוֹדִי לְאַחֵר לֹא אֶתֵּן I will not give my honour to another. Jer. 17: 5 &c. Matth. 4: 10. compare the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 505. But so far is the adoration of Christ from being *idolatry*, that it is represented as a genuine worship of God, and expressly distinguished from idolatry, 1 Cor. 8: 4—6. 1 Thess. 5: 9. 1 John 5: 20.[2]

[The following remarks on the subject of this and the preceding Illustrations, are found in the work of Professor Stuart, to which reference was made above. S.

Heb. 1: 6, "Let all the angels of God worship him."

The word *worship*, it is said, has two significations; viz. *obeisance* and *spiritual homage*. This is true; and the first of these meanings often presents itself in the Old Testament and, (as I am willing to concede,) in the Gospels. Many who worshipped Christ while he sojourned among men, i. e. prostrated themseves before him, probably knew or acknowledged nothing of his divine nature. But what shall we say of the *angels?* Are *they* ignorant of his true nature? And is not the worship which they who are pure spirits pay, of course *spiritual* and not simple obeisance?

1 See Weber's Beiträge zür geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons, p. 48, Tübingen, 1791.

2 See the Dissert. sup. cit of Wijnpersse, § XVII. p. 174 &c.

Philip. 2 : 10, 11, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

"Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth," is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the *universe* (το παν or τα παντα). What can be meant, by things in heaven (i. e. beings in heaven) bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant?

What other worship can heaven render? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual, should not that of others, who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual also? And when it is added, this worship shall be "to the glory of God the Father," I understand the sentiment to be, that Jesus in his mediatorial character is the proper object of universal adoration; but as this character has a peculiar connexion with and relation to God the Father, so the worship paid to Christ the Mediator, should redound to the glory of the Father as well as of himself.

Rom. 10: 9—14, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

The Lord *on whose name they are to call*, is plainly Christ; for he is the same in whom *they are to believe* (v. 11 and 14). And this Lord, (Christ,) on whom they are to call, and in

whom they are to believe, is *κυριος παντων, universal Lord*, and therefore able to bestow the blessings which they need.

Rev. 5: 8—14, "And when he, (i. e. Christ, see v. 6, 7,) took the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever."

If this be not *spiritual* worship — and if Christ be not the object of it here; I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine.

The apostles and primitive martyrs worshipped Christ; and they recognize the practice of worshipping him among other christians.

Acts 7: 59, 60, "And they stoned Stephen, making invocation (*επικαλουμενον*) and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit. And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay

not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep."

Now here is a dying martyr, who is expressly said to "be filled with the Holy Ghost," and to enjoy the vision of the heavenly world, and of the Saviour who was there; in his last moments, too—on the very verge of eternity; here is such a martyr, committing his departing spirit into the hands of the Lord Jesus, in the very same language and with the same confidence, with which Jesus, when expiring upon the cross, committed his spirit into the hands of the Father. This expiring disciple also, implores forgiveness for his murderers. Of whom does he implore it? Of the same Lord Jesus. Can a departing spirit be entrusted to any being, and the forgiveness of sin be expected of him, who has not omnipotence and supreme authority? And can a dying martyr, with his eyes fixed on the very vision of God, and his soul filled with the Holy Ghost, ask and pray amiss?

2 Cor. 12: 8, 9, "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me."

The *Lord* whom Paul here *besought*, is plainly Christ; for this same Lord, in answer to the apostle's supplication, says, "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength (*ἡ δυναμις μου*) is perfected in weakness." Then the apostle immediately subjoins, "Most gladly then would I rejoice in my infirmities, that the *strength of* CHRIST (*ἡ δυναμις Χριστου*) may rest upon me." A clearer case, that Christ was the object of the apostle's repeated prayer, cannot well be presented.

1 Thess. 3: 11, 12, "Now, God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you. And the Lord

make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you."

Can any distinction be here made, between the rank of those who are addressed by the apostle? And does not the twelfth verse plainly show, that the supplication of the apostle is specially directed to the Lord, i. e. to Christ?

2 Thess. 2: 16, 17, "Now, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and stablish you in every good word and work."

Here the order of the persons to whom supplication is made, is the reverse of that in the last instance quoted; which shows that nothing depends on the *order*, but that it was a matter of indifference with the apostle, which was placed first; the supplication being equally addressed to the Father and to Christ.

Rom. 1:7, "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God; called to be saints; grace to you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

Here the same blessings are solicited and expected, from Christ and the Father. See the same formula repeated, 1 Cor. 1: 3. 2 Cor. 1: 2.

Acts 1:24, "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen."

That *Lord* here means the Lord Jesus, seems evident from v. 21 and 22. It is the usual appellation, moreover, which the book of Acts gives to the Saviour. (See above p. 408 bot.)

2 Tim. 4: 14, "The Lord reward him according to his works!" Again, v. 17 and 18; "Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me, and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion. And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me un-

to his heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen." (Compare ch. 3: 11.) Usage hardly admits a doubt here, that *Lord* means Christ.

Nor can I separate from religious invocation, trust, and confidence, such expressions as these, (Acts 3: 6,) "Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk." Nor can I see how the solemn adjuration by Christ (*εν Χριστῳ*), which the apostle uses, in Rom. 9: 1, and 1 Tim. 2: 7, can be separated from religious invocation, or appeal.

We must add to all these instances of worship, the fact that Christians were so habituated to address their supplications to Christ, that "They who invoke Christ," became, it would seem, a kind of proper name, by which they were in primitive times designated as Christians.

Thus Paul (1 Cor. 1: 2) addresses himself to all *who invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, IN EVERY PLACE. That the verb *επικαλεω* is an appropriate one to designate the act of prayer, will not be questioned. The literal translation of it is *to invoke*. The simple meaning of the passage is, "I address myself to all Christians." But instead of using the name *Christians* directly, the apostle uses a periphrasis, and says, *to all the invokers of Christ*, i. e. to those who pray to him; meaning the same as *ἁγιοις*, *κλητοις*, &c. in the context. He has signified, too, that the practice of *invoking Christ*, was not confined to Corinth. He addresses "those who pray to Christ, in *every place*," (*εν παντι τοπῳ*).

Exactly in the same manner, does Ananias describe Christians, when the Lord Jesus bade him go to instruct and comfort Saul (Acts 9: 13, 14); "Lord," said he, "I have heard of many concerning this man, what things he has done (*τοις ἁγιοις σου*) to thy saints at Jerusalem; and even now, he has a

commission from the high priest, to bind all (*τους επικαλουμενους το ονομα σου*) those who invoke thy name," i. e. Christians. See the same thing repeated, v. 21.

The very heathen in the primitive age of christianity, little as they knew about Christians, discovered that they made Christ an object of worship.[1]—

Did not the Saviour give his disciples a general precept and encouragement, to make him the object of prayer? John 14: 13, 14, "If ye shall ask any thing in my name," i. e. as my disciples, on my account, said he to the apostles, "I will accomplish it" (*εγω ποιησω*). They appear to me to have understood this, as directing that he should be regarded by them as the special object of prayer. Hence, instead of finding few or no examples of prayer to Christ, in the history of the primitive Christians as exhibited in the New Testament, I find more of this nature than of any other.

When I have contemplated the precepts, which encourage prayer to Christ and the worship of him, both by the inhabitants of the heavenly world, and by the churches on earth; I then compare these things with the exclusive worship and trust, which Jehovah claims to himself.—Is. 45: 22, 23, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear." Is 42: 8, "I am the Lord; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." Jer. 17: 5—7, "Thus saith the Lord, Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord. For, he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh; but shall inhabit parched places in

[1 See the quotations from Pliny and Eusebius, on p. 412 of this work. S.]

the wilderness, in a salt land and not inhabited. Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is." Matth. 4: 10, "Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM ONLY shalt thou serve."

I am ready now to ask, whether I can avoid coming to the conclusion, either that Christ is truly divine, in as much as he is so often represented as the object of worship; or that the sacred writers have mistaken this great point, and led us to that which must be considered as idolatry. And yet the worship of Christ is placed, as it would seem, in opposition to that of idols, 1 Cor. 8: 4—6. That christianity utterly and forever renounces all idolatry—all polytheism, in a word, every thing inconsistent with the worship of one only living and true God; is a point so plain and so universally conceded, that I shall not dwell for a moment upon it.

Were it not that I fear becoming tedious, by detailing my reasons for believing in the divine nature of Christ, I should add a great number of texts, which require us with all the heart to *love* him; to *obey* him; to *confide* in him; and to *commit ourselves* to him; in such manner as I can never persuade myself to do, with respect to any being, who is not God. The New Testament tells me that my consolation, my privilege—my happiness, must be derived from *trusting in Christ*. But can I trust myself to a *finite* being, when I have an *infinite, almighty, all-sufficient* GOD, to whom I may go? Shall I be satisfied with a mite, when I can have the mines of Peru?[1]]

ILLUSTRATION 9.

Creation is ascribed to Christ.

I. John 1: 3, 10, *παντα δι' αυτου εγενετο—ὁ κοσμος δι' αυ*

[1 Stuart's Letters to Channing, p. 100—106, 3d ed. S.]

του εγενετο all things were made by him—the world was made by him.

A version of these passages maintained by Socinians, is this: "Every thing was done by Christ which belongs to the Gospel—the world was reformed by him." In reference to the first passage, it is objected, that the apostle gives no sanction for the addition, "which belongs to the Gospel:" in regard to the second, it is to be remarked, that no evidence can be adduced to prove that γενεσθαι can signify *to make anew* or *reform*. Moreover, a different signification of this word is adopted in verse 3. Again, in v. 10 it is said, ὁ κοσμος αυτον ουκ εγνω the world knew him not; and yet it is pretended, that the sense of the other clause of the same verse is, that ὁ κοσμος *the world* was reformed by him! A different modification of this exposition is this: a part of the world [men] was spiritually improved by the light, another part knew it not. But, agreeably to the usage of the New Testament, the word κοσμος, in its synecdochical sense, always denotes the unreformed part of mankind. Besides, the parallelism of v. 10 and 11, seems to forbid this exposition.[1]

Another exposition of v. 3, urged by the Socinians, is this: "Every thing was created *for* him, *on his account*." But δια [with a genitive case] is not clearly proved to signify *on account of* or *for the sake of*; and the following words, χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε ἑν without him was nothing made; evidently refer to the active cause, and confirm the ordinary signification of δια, *by*.[2]

II. Col. 1: 16, 17, εν αυτῳ εκτισθη τα παντα—τα παντα

1 See Süskind, on the recent Expositions of John 1: 1—14, in his Magazine, No. 10, p. 32 &c.

2 On the Socinian Expositions of John 1: 3, 10, see Bengel's Historico-analytical exposition of the Socinian doctrinal system; in the Tüb. Mag. No. 15. p. 156 &c. 159 &c.

δι' αυτου εκτισται — τα παντα εν αυτῳ συνεστηκε by him were all things created — all things were created by him — all things are sustained by him.

On this passage, the reader may consult Lang, On the profitable use of Teller's Lexicon.[1] Flatt's Commentatio de deitate Christi (§ 9). Oertel's Christology;[2] and Ewald, On the dignity of Jesus.[3]

The principal arguments against the interpretation of those who make *κτιζειν* to signify *a moral creation* [a reformation], or merely a great change wrought by Christ; are the following:

1. *Κτιζειν* alone, and without any addition, does not, in a single other passage, signify either a moral reformation, or in general, a great change.[4]

2. Philological proof, that the expressions *γη* and *ουρανος*, *ὁρατα* and *αορατα*, can denote Jews and Gentiles, it is utterly impossible to adduce. In the Miscellaneous Dissertations on important subjects of theological learning,[5] Justi would defend this meaning in the following manner: "The Jews are called *τα εν τοις ουρανοις* (the things in the heavens), because they were governed by divine laws, and were citizens of a theocratical nation (*βασιλεια των ουρανων*); and *ὁρατα* (things seen), because their worship of God contained many external, visible ceremonies. The gentiles on the contrary, are denominated *τα επι της γης* (the things on earth), because they were governed by human laws; and *αορατα* (things invisible), because they were to worship God spiritually" (John 4 : 24). See Nösselt's refutation of this exposition, in his Exercitt. ad Sanct. Scriptt. interpretationem.[6] Another interpretation proposed by Justi, is, that the words *τα εν τοις ουρανοις—αορατα*, denote *all mankind*

---

1 Pt. III. p. 52 &c. 2 p. 649. § 33. Note 2. 3 p. 61—67.

4 See the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 434. Schott's Epitome theol. christ. dogmatic, p. 106.

5 2d Collection, p. 200 &c, Halle, 1798. 6 p. 205 &c, Halle, 1803.

(the whole world, every creature, in the popular sense).[1] Against this, bears the remark of Keil:[2] "The generic idea (the whole) can be expressed *per μεριομον*, only by the enumeration of such species (parts) as are actually comprehended under the generic idea (or the whole)."

3. If by *ουρανος* and *αορατα*, we understand citizens of heaven, or the angels; then no moral reformation can be predicated of them. Equally inadmissible[3] is the following exposition, given in Henke's Magaz.:[4] "Every thing that belongs to his church, in heaven and on earth, is formed anew by Christ; as well those members which are known to us, as those which are not (*αορατα*?), all who are morally reformed, from the highest to the lowest, powerful kings and princes and lords (?)" Nösselt, in his Programma de una Dei in coelis terrisque familia,[5] understands the passage Col. 1: 16, as referring to the formation of a church consisting of citizens of earth and heaven.[6] But this explanation also, is liable to the objection, that this sense of *κτιζειν* is without proof; see 1 sup. And it is evinced, in the Tübing. gelehrt. Anzeig.[7] that we are by no means required to understand here a moral or spiritual creation, by the preceding or succeeding context; and yet both are appealed to by Nösselt,[8] Löfler,[5] and Stoltz.[10]

---

1 Comp. Heinrich's Nov. Test. ed. Koppianae, Vol. VII. pt. II. p. 190. and Stoltz, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Test. Heft V, 1802, p. 8 &c.

2 Comment. II, in Locum Philipp. 2: 5—11, 1804, p. X. 5.

3 See Ewald sup. cit. 4 Vol. II. No. 2. p. 291.

5 Exercitt. ad Sanct. Scriptt. interpretationem, p. 198—210.

6 See also Löfler's Supplement to Souverain's Essay on the Platonism of the Fathers of the church, p. 416, Züllichau, 1792.

7 For 1805, No. 10. p. 77. Stoltz's explanation of v. 16: "In reference to him (*εν αυτω*), was every thing celestial and terrestrial &c. created; he is the cause and object of the creation of every thing;" i. e. God would not have created the world, if the Messiah was not to have had a place in it; is exposed to the objection supr. I, that this signification of *δια* is not adequately proved.

8 sup. cit. p. 199. 9 sup. cit. sup. cit. p. 9.

In 1 Cor. 8: 6, also, Christ is represented as Creator and Lord of the world.[1]

III. Heb. 1:10, 2, 3, *δι' οὗ τους αιωνας εποιησεν—φερων τα παντα τῳ ῥηματι της δυναμεως αυτου* by whom he made the world—supporting all things by his powerful word.

On this passage, the reader may consult Lang,[2] Flatt,[3] the work On the design of John's Gospel,[4] Ewald on the dignity of Jesus,[5] and Ewald's Religionslehren der Bibel.[6] In these works, the exposition of this passage, which makes Christ the Supreme Creator of the world, in opposition to those interpreters who make the word *αιωνες* signify "times" (new times—times of the Messiah—oeconomiae divinae), or *δια* to refer only to the instrumental cause; is supported by the following arguments and observations:

1. It is evident from chap. 11 : 3, that *αιωνες* does signify *worlds* or *world*. Comp. § 34. Illust. 1.

2. The words *δι' οὗ αιωνας εποιησεν* cannot justify any of the following versions: "By him he created new times;"[7] or, "He suffered new epochs to arise, through him;" or, "By him, he created anew [reformed] the world of mankind, the human family."[8] The explanation, "By whom God determined certain periods of time [the time of the Messiah, and the preceding period[9]]," would either express too insignificant an idea, and one, moreover already included in the words *επ' εσχατου των ἡμερων* (v. 1); or, if the sense is this, "He so governed the course of events in the world, that the epochs of the world coincide with

---

1 Compare sup. § 33. Illust. 1 note. and § 42. Illust. 8.

2 Sup. cit. Pt. IV. p. 115. 3 De Deitate Christi, p. 478 &c.

4 p. 457. 5 p. 67—75. 6 Vol. II. p. 135.

7 Henke's Mag. Vol. II. No. 2. p. 296. comp. Bolten's Translation, in pt. III, of The New Test. epistles, p. 1, Altona, 1805.

8 Henke's Magazine sup. cit.

9 Paulus' Memorabilien, St. 7. S. 198—204. Stoltz's Elucidations of the New Test. No. 6. p. 6, 1802.

the advent of the Messiah;" then the idea is foreign from the terms *δι' ου τους αιωνας εποιησε.*

3. It is an undeniable fact, that the 10th verse of this chapter does ascribe the creation of the world, to Christ.

4. That *δια* does not denote merely an instrumental cause, is evident from those passages in which it is also said of the Father, "All things were created by him (*δι' αυτου*) Heb. 2:10. Rom. 11:36; as also from the general fact, that *δια* and *εκ* are used interchangeably for each other; see § 33. Illust. 1.

But as Heb. 1:1, 2 relates to the person through whom God instructed us (*εν υἱῳ ελαλησεν ἡμιν*), namely, the incarnate Logos; the words *δι' ου και τους αιωνας εποιησεν* must be understood thus: "God created the world by the same person, through whom he has spoken to us, in as much as this person is God himself, and one with the Father; i. e. he created the world by himself." In like manner, in Hos. 1:7, it is said, "I (Jehovah) will save them through [or by] Jehovah."[1]

ILLUSTRATION 10.

The sense in which Christ is called God; and explanation of passages which seem to militate against his supreme divinity.

He is called God in such a sense, that it can be said of him, that he possesses power to do whatever God can do; or, such, that the perfections of the divine nature can be predicated of him. This is evinced by various passages:

Phil. 2:6, *εν μορφῃ θεου ὑπαρχων—ισα θεῳ ειναι* being in the condition of God, (i. e. in the divine state or nature)—to be equal with God.[2] Martini makes a distinction between the

---

[1] See the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 457.

[2] The translation of this whole passage, which is given by Professor Stuart, and for which he has assigned his reasons, in his Letters to Mr. Channing (p. 88—90, 3d ed.), is the following: "Let the same mind be in you which was in Christ Jesus; who being in the condition of God, did not regard his equality with God as an object of solicitous desire, but

phrases *εν μορφῃ θεου ειναι*, and *ισα θεῳ ειναι*, and explains the passage thus:[1] "Although Christ possessed a high degree of *similarity* to God, he was not solicitously desirous of being *equal* with God;" i. e. he was far from arrogating to himself equality with God, or requiring divine worship. But neither usage nor the context favour this interpretation, more than they do several others, which agreeably to this Section better accord with the declarations of Jesus and the doctrinal system of the apostle Paul. Comp. Storr's Opusc. Academ. Vol. I. p. 322—324.

Col. 2: 9, *εν αυτῳ κατοικει παν το πληρωμα της θειοτητος* in him dwelt the entire fulness of the deity; i. e. all the attributes of the divine nature. 1:19. John 16: 15, *παντα ὁσα εχει ὁ πατηρ, εμα εστι* all things which the Father hath, are mine. 5: 19—21, *ἁ αν ὁ πατηρ ποιῃ, παντα και ὁ υἱος ὁμοιως ποιει* whatsoever things the Father doth, all these things doth the Son likewise. These words contain the reply of Jesus, to the accusation of the Jews immediately preceding: "That he made himself equal with God," v. 18.[2] In the work just referred to in the margin, several other declarations of Christ are adduced (John 12: 45. 14: 7, 9, *ὁ ἑωρακας εμε, ἑωρακε τον πατερα*, compared with v. 10. 8: 19) as evidence of that oneness with the Father, to which he laid claim. And this remark is subjoined: "If these expressions merely signify, that God spake and acted through him; they contain no more than every prophet could have said of himself."

Those passages of Scripture which appear to militate against

---

humbled himself [assumed an inferior or humble station], taking the condition of a servant, being made after the similitude of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he exhibited his humility by obedience, even to the death of the cross." S.]

1 Gabler's Journal for select theological literature, Vol. IV. p. 46.

2 On the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 196.

Christ's being God, in this sense, (viz. John 14: 28. 10: 35. 17: 3. 1 Cor. 8: 6. 15: 28,) are all explained in the work on the Object of the Gospel and epistles of John; in the Dissert. de notione regni coelestis; and in Flatt's Comment. de deitate Christi.

1. John 14: 28, *ὁ πατηρ μου μειζων μου εστιν*[1] "The Father is happier than I — he enjoys a happiness and glory which I do not enjoy in my present state." Compare *μειζων* with גדל Gen. 26: 13. It is evident from the context, that Jesus is not comparing his human nature with the divine nature of the Father; but the situation of his human nature at that time, with the happiness of the Father. The connexion of the words *ὁτι ὁ πατηρ μου—εστι* with the previous clause *ει ηγαπατε με*, appears thus to be more natural and perspicuous, than in the explanation of Kuinöl:[2] "the Father will do more through you, for the dissemination of my doctrines, than I effected whilst on earth, or than I could effect by a longer residence in this world." And the reference to the previous clause, seems almost entirely neglected, in the explanation: "God can protect you better than my visible presence could."[3] — *Moreover*, Jesus could ascribe to his person in general, such predicates as belonged properly to only a part of his entire person, i. e. only to his human or to his divine nature; just as we attribute to a man [the whole man], properties and actions which belong exclusively to either his soul or his body.

2. John 10: 35, 36, *ει εκεινους ειπε θεους—ὁ υἱος του θεου ειμι* if the Scripture called them gods, to whom the word of God was addressed; and if the Scripture is incontrovertible; do ye say of him whom the Father hath consecrated and sent into the world, "Thou blasphemest," because I said I am the

---

1 Zweck Johannis, § 49. Flatt, de Deitate Christi, p. 186.

2 Comment. p. 579. 3 Stoltz's Erläuterungen in loc.

Son of God?[1] That Jesus called himself Son of God, in a far higher sense, than that in which the Jewish judges are so called (Ps. 82: 6), is proved by the words *ὸν ὸ πατηρ ἡγιασε και απεστειλεν εις τον κοσμον* "whom the Father distinguished, by sending him." Besides, Jesus had previously determined the sense in which he called himself *υἱος θεου* (v. 28, 30), and he was distinctly understood by his opponents, who charged him with making himself God [*θεον σεαυτον ποιεις*]. He also repeated the explanation, v. 38, *εν εμοι ὸ πατηρ, καγω εν αυτῳ* the Father is in me, and I in him. But it was not his intention, in that place, to give them a more definite explanation of the nature of his person.

3. John 17: 3, *αὐτη εστιν ἡ ζωη ἡ αιωνιος, ἱνα γινωσκωσι σε τον μονον αληθινον θεον, και ὸν απεστειλας Ἰησουν Χριστον* this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. Christ styles the Father, "The only true God," not in opposition to himself, but in opposition to the false gods of the heathen. This is evinced by the expression *πασα σαρξ* in v. 2, *all men*, Jews or gentiles, [over whom power was given to the Son to give them eternal life]; and by the glorification (v. 1) of the Father through the Son [by the propagation of belief in the one true God, by means of christianity]. This interpretation is further supported by the fact, that we have every reason to believe that in this text, Christ expressed the very essence of christianity.[2]

4. 1 Cor. 8: 6, But we acknowledge only one God, the Father; from whom are all things (derived), and we in him [for whose glory we also exist]; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things [by whom all things were created], and we

1 On the Object of the Gospel of John, § 96. Flatt sup. cit. p. 110—112.

2 Nösselt. Opusc. ad interpretationem Script. Fasc. II. p. 71 &c.

by him [by whom also we were created].[1] The fact that the Father is called *εἷς θεος* one God, no more denies the divinity [*θειοτης*] of Jesus, than the circumstance that Jesus is called *εἷς κυριος* one Lord, denies the dominion [*κυριοτης*] of the Father. But that *κυριος* cannot, in this place, signify *teacher*, as Teller contends; is evident from the fact, that in the 5th verse *θεοι* and *κυριοι* are synonymous; and from a comparison of the two predicates *ἐξ οὗ τα παντα* and *δι' οὗ τα παντα* in v. 6, the former of which is attributed to the *θεος πατηρ*, and the latter to *κυριος Ιησους Χριστος* the Lord Jesus Christ. Comp. Illustration 9.

5. 1 Cor. 15:28, *ὁταν δε ὑποταγῃ αυτῳ* (*τῳ Χριστῳ*) *τα παντα, τοτε και αυτος ὁ υἱος ὑποταγησεται τῳ ὑποταξαντι αυτῳ τα παντα* but when he shall have subjected all things unto him (Christ), then shall the Son himself also be subject to him who made all things subject to him. The following explanation of this passage, is given in the Dissertation de Notione regni coelestis:[2] Moreover, if every thing has been subjected to the Son (by the Father), then the Son himself must also be subject to him (then it is evident, that the Son is subject to him) who made all things subject unto him." *Ὁταν* does not here indicate a precise time, any more than in v. 27; but it signifies *if, whereas*. See Rom. 2: 14. The future *ὑποταγησεται* indicates an inference made: as if it were written *δηλον ὁτι* (comp. v. 27) *και αυτος ὁ υἱος ὑποτασσεται*. The same sense is expressed by the future in Rom. 6: 5. 2: 26. In like manner, *τοτε* does not here express succession of time; but is either the sign of the apodosis (comp. LXX, Ps. 119: 91. Prov. 2: 5), or a pleonasm (LXX, Psalm 69: 5), or it is equivalent to *therefore*. (Comp. Jer. 22: 15, the Heb. אָז). In the opinion of Grotius

[1] Compare Illust. 9 supra. [2] sup. cit.

and others, the passage 1 Cor. 15 : 24—28, refers to what is termed the Mediatorial reign of Jesus, regimen oeconomicum.[1]

ILLUSTRATION 11.

Explanation of passages in which Christ is called God.

I. John 1: 1, θεος ην ὁ λογος the Word was God. On this passage and onward to v. 14, the reader may consult the work on the Object of the Gospel of John,[2] Flatt de Deitate Christi,[3] and Süskind on the late explanations of John 1: 1—14.[4] The principal remarks contained in these several works, relative to this subject, are the following :

1. The conjecture, that the introduction, v. 1—5 or 1—18, may not be genuine, is totally unfounded. Neither is there the semblance of evidence, in support of the violent change of the text by Crellius, who would read : θεου ην ὁ λογος, or of Bardt, who would read : θεος ην και ὁ λογος.

2. The general sense of the whole passage v. 1—18, has been stated thus : " Wisdom and understanding, or power (the Word), were present in God, at the creation of the world—by his wisdom or power, he created all things ;—and this wisdom or power was visibly manifested in Jesus." In Paulus' Memorabilia, Vol. VIII. No. 3, to support the explanation, " The deity as teaching by words and works," it is urged, that John, in v. 1—3, is refuting the error of the Jewish literati, who regarded the personified Word of God, or the creative word, as something separate from God, as an intermediate being.[5] But, it

---

1 See Morus, Epitome theol. christianae, 2d ed. p. 179, 183, 185. compare Comment. exegetico-histor. in Epitomen, Tom. II. p. 192. Knapp, Scripta varii argumenti, p. 71. Stoltz, Erläuterungen zum Neuen Test. on 1 Cor. 15: 24, 28.

2 p. 452 &c. 430 &c. 49 &c. (on the word λογος.) 3 § V, VI.

4 In his Mag. für christ. Dog. und Moral, Vol. X. No. I.

5 Compare, in opposition to this, Süskind sup. cit. p. 10—24. and Paulus himself, in his Comment. on John, p. 74—78.

may be replied: (a) it is not natural, by the words ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο the word became flesh, to understand merely the manifestation of the divine power or wisdom *through* Christ.—(b) λογος is the same subject which in v. 5 is called το φως· and this subject is manifestly described, in v. 9—12, as a *concrete*. —(c) If all the propositions, v. 1—3, expressed nothing more than, "God has created all things by *his* wisdom or power," the evangelist would be guilty of intolerable garrulity. And where would be the necessity of reiterating the assurance, v. 1, 2, "the power or wisdom of God was with God," ὁ λογος ην προς τον θεον?

The hypothesis, that "the notion of a real union of an emanated divine power with Jesus, was either taught by John in accommodation to the current opinions of those days, or was proposed by him as his personal opinion;" is refuted in the dissertation of Süskind, to which allusion has been made, (p. 51—75,) where it is shewn, that the existence of such opinions in that age, cannot be proved from history.

3. Θεος, without the article, in the sentence θεος ην ὁ λογος, cannot be understood in a lower sense, than ὁ θεος, with the article. For,—(a) θεος, without any addition, in other passages of the New Testament, never has any other signification, than that of the only true God. And that the article makes no difference, appears from v. 6 (παρα θεου), 13, 18. 2 Cor. 1: 21. 5: 5. — (b) Not only is the λογος θεος represented as existing before the origin of all things (v. 1, 2), but to him is attributed the creation of all things (v. 3); an act which can belong only to the supreme God.

Paulus, in his commentary on the Gospel of John,[1] has given the most full development of that explanation of θεος ην ὁ λογος, which takes θεος in an inferior sense; and by λογος un-

[1] p. 35—94. comp. Kuinöl Comment. Proleg. p. 73—80, 93.

derstands an intelligent being exterior to God, and inferior to him; a being who, according to the idea of the Alexandrian Jews, proceeded from God, in a peculiar manner, before the world existed; who was most intimately connected with God, and was far superior to all other spirits. This explanation rests chiefly on the coincidence of the ideas of John with those of Philo his contemporary, relative to his Logos. In the well known passage of his work "de Somniis," Philo makes a difference between θεος with the article, and the same word without it; and applies the name θεος without an article, to the λογος. But, independently of the fact, that it is doubtful whether John was acquainted with the ideas of Philo, or had reason to suppose an acquaintance with them in his hearers;[1] to derive from Philo an explanation of the words θεος ην ὁ λογος, seems not very consistent, from the circumstance, that in the very passage here alluded to, Philo himself twice notices the difficulty and novelty of transferring the name *God* to a being exterior to the supreme deity. In one place he says, the Logos (without the article) can be called God, only εν καταχρησει [by catachresis, i. e. wresting a word from its native signification]. In a subsequent passage, he says, "the Scriptures are not very particular in the application of names [they are not religiously scrupulous, ου δεισιδαιμονων περι την θεσιν των ονοματων], when they apply even the name of God himself (without the article), to the eldest Logos of God." The arguments adduced in the Commentary of Kuinöl,[2] to prove that even in the time of Christ, there prevailed an idea among the Jews in Palestine, that before the creation, an intelligence emanated immediately from the Deity, which was to appear on earth in the person of the Messiah; are very problematical; and are derived in part from such Jewish

1 Magazine, No. 10. p. 11.

2 p. 80—90. compare Bertholdt Christol. Jud. Jesu apostolorumque aetate, § 22—24, Erlangen, 1811.

writings as either were certainly written since that time, or whose date is very uncertain.

4. In whatever manner we explain the word λογος, it is perfectly accordant with the usage of the Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek, to designate a concrete by the name of an abstract. If we look for the origin of the name Logos, in the earlier work of John, in Rev. 19: 13, ὁ λογος θεου, (where Jesus is represented as a conqueror of the enemies of his doctrines v. 19,) its most probable signification is: "Speaker or Messenger of God, divine Instructer;" just as תְּפִלָּה prayer, in Ps. 109 : 4 signifies, One who prays. Agreeably to this explanation, the name λογος (teacher) was a name of Christ, which John used in his Gospel, on supposition that it would be admitted by those against whom he wrote, namely, the Cerinthians and disciples of John.

A variety of interpretations and explanations of the meaning of the word Logos, are contained in the following late works: Keil, de doctoribus veteris ecclesiae culpa corruptae per Platonicas sententias theologiae liberandis (p. 7 &c.); Paulus' Commentary on the Gospel of John (p. 4—94); Eichhorn's Introduction to the N. Test. (Vol. II. § 162); Bertholdt's Christologia Judaeorum (§ 23 &c.); and Kuinöl, Comment. in Evangel. Johannis, Prolegg. (§ 7); in the last of which, the most important works on the meaning of this word, are mentioned. Nor must the late explanation, which has been advocated especially by Tittmann, be forgotten. Agreeably to this, ὁ λογος is equivalent to ὁ λεγομενος, ὁ ερχομενος he that was promised, the Messiah.[1]

5. Another explanation of the words θεος ην ὁ λογος, is this:[2] *God was the speaker*, (ὁ λογος instead of ὁ λεγων,) who commissioned him, and made known his will through him; for he

1 Kuinöl sup. cit. § 7. p. 63—65.

2 Paulus' Memorabilia. Vol. I. No. 2. p. 27—34.

spake nothing, except what he had heard of God when he was with him (John 8: 26). The following objections to this view, are contained in the Allgemeine Bibliothek,[1] and in the Tübing. gel. Anzeigen:[2] (a) Agreeably to this explanation, no suitable signification could be attached to the 2d verse, *ουτος ην εν αρχη προς τον θεον* the same was in the beginning with God. For, if we translate it, "God was the speaker, this Speaker (who was God himself) was in the beginning with God;" then John could not say, that Christ *as speaker*, or as he actually taught mankind, was with God in the beginning of the world. For in the beginning of the world, before any members of the human family existed, he could not have existed as the Teacher of men, consequently also not as the Speaker. In other words, the conclusion of the first verse, in connexion with the second, could not signify, "It was properly God, who spake to man; because he through whom God spake, was in the beginning of the world sent by God [*ην προς τον θεον*] in order to instruct men."[3]—By *ουτος*, we must understand the *person* of the speaker, as distinct from his office of teacher. But then the preceding words would signify, "God was the person of the speaker." And this is the very idea which this interpretation is intended to avoid.—(b) As the creation of the world is attributed to this Logos, in v. 3; no being distinct from the Deity, can possibly be intended.

II. John 20: 28, *ὁ κυριος μου και ὁ θεος μου* My Lord and my God. In the work on the Object of the Gospel of John (§ 90), the following remarks are made on this passage: "The exclamation of Thomas, cannot well be a mere expression of admiration. Independently of the fact that this phrase, as an exclamation of admiration, cannot be proved to have been customary among the Jews in the time of Jesus; how could Jesus

[1] Vol. 107. p. 271. [2] p. 323, 1792. [3] Memorabilia, p. 32.

(v. 29) have regarded it as a proof of faith?—Nor can θεος be wrested from its proper signification, and made to signify a great benefactor. This the usage of the language forbids. This exclamation of Thomas must, therefore, be taken in its literal sense; and must be regarded as an open declaration of his belief, that there existed the closest possible union between Jesus and God (John 14:9, 10), or of his belief in the divinity of Christ. And had this exclamation implied what is erroneous, Jesus could not have approved it (v. 29); but on the other hand, must inevitably have censured it. Compare the passage next cited.

III. 1 John 5 : 20, *ουτος εστιν ὁ αληθινος θεος* this is the true God. In the work on the Object of the Gospel of John (p. 445), the genuineness of the reading *θεος*, is vindicated against the objections of Semler, taken from Hilary de Trinitate. It is also remarked (p. 231), that agreeably to Hebrew usage,[2] the demonstrative *ουτος* is placed instead of the relative *ὁς*, as in Acts 8: 26. 10 : 36. and that *ουτος* is more naturally referred to the nearer antecedent *Ιησου Χριστῳ*, than to the more remote *εν τῳ αληθινῳ*.[3]

IV. Rom. 9: 5, [*ὡν οἱ πατερες, και εξ ὡν ὁ Χριστος, το κατα σαρκα, ὁ ων επι παντων θεος ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας. Αμην*, "Whose are the Fathers; and from whom, in respect to the flesh (his human nature), Christ (descended), who is the supreme God, blessed for ever. Amen."[4]] On this passage, the reader may consult the following works: Noesselt, Interpretatio grammatica Epist. ad Rom. cap. 9;[5] Koppe's Comment. on the Romans (p. 194 &c.); Michaelis' notes to his Translation

---

1 Kuinöl in loc. 2 Observv. p. 119.

3 Ewald sup. cit. p. 102—104. and his Religionslehren der Bibel, Th. II. S. 139.

[4 See Professor Stuart's Lett. to Wm. E. Channing, p. 78, 3d. ed. S.]

5 Opusc. fasc. I. n. VI. § 7 &c.

of the New Testament ;[1] Eckermann's Theological Contributions ;[2] Ewald on the Dignity of Jesus ;[3] Ewald's Religionslehren der Bibel ;[4] Flatt's Annotationes ad loca quaedam epistolae Pauli ad Romanos ;[5] [and Professor Stuart's Letters &c. on the Divinity of Christ, p. 78, 79, 3d edit. S.]

It may be inquired whether the doxology in this passage, supposing it to begin at ὁ ων επι παντων, or to be confined to the words θεος ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας, refer to Christ, or to God the Father. Even in the Init. Evang. Johan. restaur.[6] of Artemonius (or of the Socinian writer, Samuel Crellius), it is remarked, that a doxology here would be altogether out of place, as Paul (v. 1, 2) is speaking under the influence of the deepest grief, and lamenting the loss of those privileges which his countrymen might have enjoyed (v. 3—8, 31. 10: 19 &c.). A prayer (δεησις 10: 1), and not a doxology, would have been adapted to the state of mind in which the apostle wrote these words (James 5: 13). In addition to this evidence, the following arguments are adduced in the works above referred to, in refutation of the opinion that the whole passage (ὁ ων—αιωνας) is a doxology, addressed to God the Father : (a) The words το κατα σαρκα, which refer to the human nature of Christ, require a corresponding clause relating to his higher nature ; as for example, in ch. 1: 3. comp. Gal. 4: 29.—(b) Such a sudden transition from one person to another, from Christ to God the Father, could not be made without some transitive particle, such as δε (in the doxology 1 Tim. 1: 17). The remarks made by Stoltz against the force of this argument,[7] appear to refer only to the statement that δε should stand between θεος and ευλογη-

1 Vol. III. p. 93 &c. 2 Vol. I. No. 3. p. 156 &c.
3 p. 83—98. 4 Pt. II. p. 136. 5 p. 1827, 1801.
6 Pt. I. c. XLII. § III. No. 2. § VII. p. 230, 237.
7 Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, 2te Ausg. Heft 3. S. 169.

τος. At least, it can by no means be asserted, that δε between ὁ and ων, would be erroneous.—(c) For the very reason, that the particle δε is not found between ὁ and ων, it is most natural to refer ὁ ων to Χριστος, the subject immediately preceding. The participle is put for ὁς εστι· and this doxology when referred to Christ, has a striking similarity to the doxology to God the Father (Rom. 1: 25). And Paul would have written ὁς εστιν here as well as in 1: 25, if the word εστι, understood from the preceding clause και εξ—σαρκα, had not been still in his mind.[1]

The difficulty stated by Crellius, attends also the explanation of Justi,[2] who separates the words ὁ ων επι παντων from those that follow, θεος—αιωνας; and translates the passage thus: "whose ancestors were those (celebrated) fathers, from whom even, in regard to his mortal body, the Messiah is descended, who is exalted above above all (the fathers). Blessed be God (for this) to eternity!"[3] But another difficulty, by which this explanation is encumbered, is that not only Paul, but also other writers always in their doxologies, place the predicate ευλογητος before its subject. See 2 Cor. 1: 3. Ephes. 1: 3. 1 Pet. 1: 3. Luke 1: 68. 2 Macc. 15: 34. Ps. 68: 36. and others. Trommius, in his Concordance to the LXX, gives a number of examples, under the word ευλογητος.[4] J. F. Flatt

---

[1] Eckermann sup. cit. p. 156 &c.

[2] Paulus' Memorabilia, Vol. I. No. 1, compared with the Dissertation of Justi on the same passage, in his Miscellaneous Dissertations on important points of theological learning, Vol. 2 for 1798, p. 308 &c.

[3] Comp. Herzog's version of the epistle to the Romans with Notes, p. 41, 87. and Oertel's Christology, p 211 &c.

[4] For the gratification of the critical reader who has not the version of the LXX, the translator has selected some of these examples, which fully evince the truth of our author's remark: Gen 9: 26, ευλογητος κυριος ὁ θεος. 14: 20, και ευλογητος ὁ θεος ὁ ὑψιστος. 24: 27, ευλογητος κυριος ὁ θεος του κυριου μου. Ex. 18: 10, ευλογητος κυριος ὁτι εξειλετο τον λαον αυτου. Ruth 4: 14, ευλογητος κυριος ὁς

remarks that *ευλογητος* is placed first, not only in those instances in which the doxology begins a discourse, but also when it is found in the middle or at the conclusion of a sentence.[1] The only passage in the LXX, which seems to be an exception to the preceding remark, is Ps. 68 : 19, *κυριος ὁ θεος ευλογητος, ευλογητος κυριος ἡμεραν καθ' ἡμεραν*, and on this Stoltz lays a great deal of stress.[2] But a comparison of this verse with the Hebrew text, proves that the words *κυριος ὁ θεος* (verse 19), which correspond to the Hebrew יָהּ אֲדֹנָי must be separated from *ευλογητος*, and be translated thus : "God (is) Lord (Jehovah)." Nor is the case altered, if, with Michaelis, we translate, "among whom God, Jehovah, will dwell;" or with Schnurrer,[3] Dathe, Knapp, Rosenmüller,[4] and De Wette,[5] regard יָהּ אֲדֹנָי as an apostrophe to God, "there thou dwellest, God, Jehovah," or "that thou mayest dwell there." In the Hebrew, בָּרוּךְ (blessed) is not in the 19th but in the 20th verse. But if an appeal be made to the fact, that the LXX repeat the word *ευλογητος*, I reply, they were not able to make sense of the words יָהּ אֲדֹנָי, and therefore supplied *ευλογητος*, בָּרוּךְ, out of the beginning of the 20th verse. But that they did this as a kind of desperate measure, is evident from the fact, that they nevertheless put another *ευλογητος* in the beginning of the 20th verse. In so doing they themselves confess, that according to

---

ου κατελυσε σοι. 1 Sam. 25 : 32, *ευλογητος κυριος ὁ θεος Ισραηλ.* 2 Sam. 18 : 28, *ευλογητος κυριος ὁ θεος σου.* Dan. 3 : 28, *και απεκριθη Ναβουχοδονοσορ ὁ βασιλευς, και ειπεν, Ευλογητος ὁ θεος του Σεδραχ, Μισαχ, Αβεδνεγω, ὁς απεστειλε τον αγγελον αυτου κ.τ.λ.* The number of examples adduced by Trommius, amounts to upward of thirty. S.]

1 Annotatt. ad loca quaedam Epist. Pauli ad Romanos, p. 19—22 &c.

2 Erläuterungen zum Neuen Test. 2 augs. Heft 3. S. 170.

3 Dissert. in Ps. 68, 1784, ad h. l.

4 Scholia in Psalm. Vol. III. ad h l.

5 Ubersetzung der Schriften des Alten Bundes, Band 3.

the usage of the language, *ευλογητος* בָּרוּךְ belongs to the subsequent אֲדֹנָי *κυριος*. And the only reason for their supplying a בָּרוּךְ in this arbitrary manner, was that they could make no sense out of the latter clause of the 19th verse. It is however, not impossible, (as J. F. Flatt remarks,[1]) that some transcriber wrote the word *ευλογητος* twice, through inadvertence. But, be this as it may, a single exception to a rule which is established by such a vast multitude of examples, can prove nothing. Their translation ought properly to be expressed thus: "Jehovah is the praiseworthy God; praise be to God." Nearly all the ancient translators were entirely at a loss how to translate this passage, and accordingly they allowed themselves different, arbitrary methods. Justi does indeed remark,[2] that "no reasonable cause can be perceived, why it must always be written *ευλογητος ὁ θεος* blessed be God! and why we might not just as well say, *θεος ευλογητος*, God be blessed! But we should always be very cautious about reasoning against the usage of language; for that which is unnecessary in itself, may be rendered necessary by usage.[3] So in the German language also [and in the English], we can say, God be blessed! or, blessed be God! praise be to God! or, to God be praise; but we cannot, instead of thank God! say, God thank![4] In the same manner, the usus loquendi of the Hebrew may have rendered it necessary

---

[1] In the Dissert. sup. cit. p. 21. [2] sup. cit. p. 24. p. 171.

[3 Every schoolboy can repeat the lines of Horace, in which this principle, just in itself and acknowledged by every critical scholar, has been transmitted inviolate through successive centuries:

"— si volet usus,
Quem penes arbitrium est, et jus et norma loquendi." S.]

[4 There are no authorised phrases in the English language, which would be a literal version of this last example in the German. The translator has therefore selected one which differs but little from the sense of the original, whilst it perfectly exemplifies the author's remark; and which, in return, it may be observed, is equally incapable of being rendered literally into the German. S.]

in doxologies, always to place the predicate בָּרוּךְ (Ps. 68: 29 &c.) first. But had it been the intention of Paul here, to deviate from the uniform custom of Hebrew writers,[1] for the purpose of laying peculiar stress[2] on the name of God; then he ought to have put *εστι* or *ειη* between *θεος* and *ευλογητος*, as the LXX have done (Ps. 119: 12. Dan. 3: 26), to prevent *ευλογητος* from being regarded as a mere epithet, and from being connected, together with *θεος*, with what precedes both.[3] As this was not done, I cannot regard the conclusion of the verse, *ευλογητος—αιωνας*, as a doxology to God the Father; which, moreover, as has been already remarked, would here be out of place. The words which precede, *ὁ ων επι παντων*, will admit of several explanations. They may signify, "Christ who is over all things (Eph. 4: 6. comp. 1: 21, and Acts 10: 36, *Ιησους Χριστος εστι παντων κυριος*), as the adorable God;" i. e. "who was appointed Lord over all things, because he is himself the adorable God."[4] Or, the plan of Justi may be adopted, and *πατερων* be supplied to *παντων*. The sense would then be this: "He is exalted above the most illustrious fathers [ancestors] of the Jews, as the adorable God." In like manner, Jesus adduces his preexistence and his divine nature (*πριν—*

[1] The Rabbinical expressions יהוה יתברך, and שם יתברך, (see Gabler's Journal for select theological literature, 1804, Vol. I. p. 547,) can prove nothing against the uniform usage of the Old Testament, the LXX, and the New Testament.

[2] It has been proved (in the Dissert. of Flatt sup. cit.), that it cannot be taken for granted, that Paul placed the word *θεος* in Rom. 9: 5 first, in order to lay peculiar stress upon it. For, even if the stress was to have been laid on *θεος*, the same is the case in those passages of the Old Testament, in which God is opposed to the pagan deities; and yet *ευλογητος* is placed first in every instance in which the substantive verb (*ειμι, γινομαι*) is wanting in the doxology.

[3] Flatt's Dissert. sup. cit. p. 25 &c.

[4] See note 5 infra, on Heb. 1: 3.

εγω ειμι v. 58), as evidence of the truth of his assertion, that he is greater than Abraham, John 8: 50. comp. v. 53, μειζων. Either of these explanations may be adopted, provided it can be vindicated against the grammatical difficulty urged by Justi (sup. cit.). He says, "If Paul had intended, by the phrases εξ ὡν ὁ Χριστος το κατα σαρκα and ὁ ων ευλογητος, to express the antithesis between the human and the divine nature of Christ, he must have said ὁ και ων, or ὁ αυτος ων (qui *idem* est dominus omnium rerum). But in Rom. 1 : 3, 4, the two clauses of the sentence, in which Christ is considered κατα σαρκα and κατα πνευμα, are connected neither by a και nor by an αυτος.[1] Moreover, the words θεος ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας, are not placed in opposition to the words το κατα σαρκα, but must be connected with the preceding ὁ επι παντων· to which, even according to Justi's own explanation, neither και nor αυτος is required; and they contain the reason, why he who κατα σαρκα was descended from the fathers, could still be said to be επι παντων. And the clause το κατα σαρκα, which is frigid and useless according to Justi's explanation, possesses an appropriate signification, only when the whole sentence is rendered thus: "Christ as the adorable God, is exalted over all things (or, over all the ancestors of the Jews)."[2]

V. Heb. 1: 8, προς δε τον υἱον—αιωνος but to the Son, on the other hand, he says, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." In reference to this passage, in which the words of Ps. 45 : 7, ὁ θρονος σου, ὁ θεος, εις τον αιωνα του αιωνος, are applied to Christ; it may be remarked,[3] that the usage of the lan-

[1] Ewald on the Dignity of Jesus, p. 92.

[2] Even if the writings of the apostle Paul did not contain any formal doxology to Jesus, still the predicates which are ascribed to him in the passages of Paul adduced in Illust. 6, 7, 9, accord with a doxology, in the most perfect manner. See Stoltz sup. cit. p. 174.

[3] Commentary on the Hebrews, Note 4.

guage admits of no other explanation than one, by which a human king is called *God* in the proper sense. Nor can a single instance be found, in which an individual specified person is called by the name אֱלֹהִים, in any other than the proper sense of the word.

The explanation of the words *ὁ θρονος σου, ὁ θεος*, as signifying, "God is the security of thy throne," which is adopted by Socinians and by Grotius; is inconsistent with the scope of the whole passage, which is, to evince the preeminence of Christ above angels.[1] Moreover, both the ancient and the modern translators considered the phrase *ὁ θεος* as being in the vocative case.

On the passage 2 Pet. 1: 3, in which *θεια δυναμις* (divine power) is attributed to Christ, the reader may recur to Illustration 6.

I would not appeal to Tit. 2: 13, inasmuch as it appears not to be a correct opinion, (though Henke subscribes to it[2]) that if *μεγαλου θεου did not* refer to Christ, the article *του* before *σωτηρος* would need to be repeated.[3] For the same reason, it may be doubted, whether in 2 Thess. 1: 12, *του θεου ἡμων*, as well as *κυριου*, ought not to be joined with *Ιησου Χριστου*. But, in 1 Tim. 6 : 13, where Jesus Christ (v. 14) and God (v. 15) are distinguished from one another, no article is found between the words *του θεου του ζωοποιουντος τα παντα* and *Χριστου Ιησου*.

ILLUSTRATION 12.

Other names by which Christ is designated, proving his divinity.

Other names are given to Christ in Scripture, which amount to the same as *θεος*. In 1 John 1 : 2 (comp. 5 : 20) he is de-

1 See Ewald sup. cit. p. 98—102.

2 Lineamenta Inst. fidei Christianae, p. 73.

3 Wolfii Curae philol. ad l. c.

nominated ἡ ζωη ἡ αιωνιος *eternal life*. The words εγω ειμι, in John 13: 19. 8: 24, 28, signify, "*I am God*;" as has been proved, in the work on the Object of the Gospel of John (p. 400 &c.). For, ειμι is a translation of the Hebrew word הוּא (comp. LXX Deut. 32 : 39); which, according to the usage of the Hebrews and Arabs, signifies *God*; and the Greek word αυτος has the same signification in 1 John 2: 29.[1]

Christ is also called κυριος Lord, in 1 Cor. 8 : 6 (comp. § 33. Illust. 1. § 42. Illust. 9.

He is called πνευματικη πετρα ακολουθουσα the spiritual rock which accompanied them, 1 Cor. 10 : 4. In the Comment. on Heb. 12 : 26, these words are explained in the following manner: "The invisible (and supremely perfect) rock, who accompanied the Israelites, through whose agency [εκ, like the Heb. מ] they were enabled to drink (out of the material rock)." In Deut. 32 : 10—12, God is said to have accompanied the Israelites; and in the same chapter, v. 14, 15, 18, the name rock (צור) is applied to him. Πνευματικος designates the almighty power of God. See Gal. 4: 29. Rom. 4: 17—21. The reader may consult Michaelis' Notes on the 1 epist. to the Corinthians (p. 232); and Ewald's Religionslehren der Bibel, Vol. II. p. 136 &c.

The name *Christ* is itself a divine compellation. For, in 2 Cor. 11:10. Rom. 11: 1, Paul swears by the name of Christ. In the Dissert. on the epistles to the Corinthians,[2] the former of these passages, εστιν αληθεια Χριστου εν εμοι, is explained by "Mihi certissimum est." (נָכוֹן הַדָּבָר Gen. 41: 32). Αληθεια Χριστου, according to a well known Hebrew idiom, signifies the same as αληθεια θεου, namely, res verissima.

---

[1] Compare the Dissert. On the alternate use of the names *God* and *Son of God*, in the first epistle of John, in the New Contributions for the promotion of rational views of Religion, No. 2. p. 54 &c.

[1] Note 159. Opuscula acad. Vol. II. p. 336.

Finally, what the Old Testament asserts of God, is also applied to *Christ*, John 12: 41, *οτε ειδε την δοξαν αυτου·* (comp. with v. 40 and Is. 6 : 10). The word *αυτου*, in this passage, must be referred to Christ; as well as in v. 37, 42.[1] Now, the 40th v. of this ch. corresponds with Is. 6: 1—5, where the prophet is describing the glory of God; consequently, by applying this passage to Christ, John ascribes divine glory to him. Heb. 1: 10—12, unto the Son he saith, Thou Lord in the beginning of all things didst create the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands: they shall pass away, but thou remainest: they shall grow old as a garment, and thou shalt fold them up as a vesture to change them. Comp. Ps. 102 : 26—28. Heb. 12: 26. (comp. Deut. 5: 22 &c.) Here Christ is represented as the person, who revealed himself on Sinai; *ον ἡ φωνη την γην εσαλευσε τοτε·* and consequently as God himself.[2]

§ 43.

Importance of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ.

No one can detract from the supreme dignity of Christ, without either totally denying him that adoration which is his due, or offering it in an improper manner (1); and without detracting also from the value of that salutary influence which he has exerted and still exerts on mankind. For, on the dignity of his person (§ 82, 78) the importance of this influence is suspended. Accordingly christians, at their first reception among the professors of this

1 Dissert. I, in libros N. T. historicos, p. 87 &c.

2 See Comment. on Hebrews, in loc. Note o.

religion, which places the divine worship of Jesus in indissoluble connexion with christian piety (2), are dedicated to Christ, as God (4), by the ordinance of baptism (3).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

The obligation of men to believe in Christ as God.

Whoever wilfully contradicts the declarations of Jesus, relative to his exalted nature and the adoration which is due to him,[1] or who refuses to believe in the dignity of Jesus Christ the Son of God [*πιστευειν τῳ ονοματι του Ιησου Χριστου*], is guilty of transgressing the divine command, and is as far from pleasing God, as he who is destitute of love for his fellow man. 1 John 3: 23, *αὑτη εστιν ἡ εντολη αυτου, ἱνα πιστευσωμεν τῳ ονοματι του υἱου αυτου Ιησου Χριστου, και αγαπωμεν αλληλους* this is his commandment, that we believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another. comp. v. 22. John 3 : 35, 36, *ὁ απειθων τῳ υἱῳ, ουκ οψεται ζωην, αλλ᾽ ἡ οργη του θεου μενει επ᾽ αυτον* he that believeth not on the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him. On the disastrous influence which antiscriptural representations of Christ may have on our conduct; the reader may consult the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, § 103.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

The same subject continued.

Since it is a fact, that it has pleased God to take the man Jesus into an extraordinary union with himself, to commit all things into his hands, to appoint him the immediate judge of the world, and to bestow his love and blessings upon us only through him; we are called upon by love to the Father and by reverence for him, as well as by our dependance on him to make us

1 See the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, § 98, 101, 102.

happy both in the present and the future world—in short, we are called upon by our piety as christians, to love and honour Christ, as being just what the Father has represented him, and to repose our confidence in him.[1] In the Dissert. "On the Spirit of Christianity,"[2] it is proved, that the dignity and exalted nature of the person of Christ, constituted a principal subject of the instruction of Jesus and his apostles.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The genuineness of the Baptismal Formula, MATTH. 28: 19.

Matth. 28: 19, *πορευθεντες ουν μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη, βαπτιζοντες αυτους εις το ονομα του πατρος και του υἱου και του ἁγιου πνευματος*. Go therefore, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The doubt which has been advanced by Teller,[3] relative to the genuineness of this passage, is not only unsupported by any critical authority, but is not favoured by the conjecture, which has been derived from the circumstance, that in several passages of the New Testament, instead of "baptism in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" [*εις το ονομα ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ*], baptism in the name of Christ only is mentioned; as, for example, in Acts 8 : 16. 19 : 5, *εις το ονομα του κυριου Ιησου*. Acts 10: 48. 2: 38, *εν*, and *επι τῳ ονοματι Ιησου Χριστου*. Gal. 3: 27. Rom. 6: 3, *εις Χριστον*. For, it is manifest, that the latter mode of expression originated merely from abbreviation; and for the same reason, also, the word *baptism* is sometimes placed entirely alone, without any additional clause; as in Acts 8: 12. 16 : 15. 18 : 8. And if the

1 See Dissert. 2, on the Epistle to the Colossians, Note 42 and 46, in Opusc. Acad. Vol. II. p. 105—197.

2 Flatt's Magazine, Vol. I. p. 11—126.

3 Excurs. II, ad Burneti librum de fide et officiis, p. 262.

writers of the New Testament wished to abbreviate the formula of baptism which Christ used at the institution of this ordinance, they would not be likely to use the first words, *εις το ονομα του πατρος*, in the name of the Father, instead of the whole; for these words could not sufficiently distinguish the christian profession of faith, from that of the Jews. On the other hand, the words *εις το ονομα του υἱου* (*Ιησου Χριστου*), in the name of the Son Jesus Christ, could with propriety be used instead of the whole formula, without an imperfect expression of its spirit; since no one can baptize in the name [i. e. to the honour] of Jesus Christ (Illust. 4), who does not in the baptism confine himself strictly to the instructions and command of Christ, and of course also to the formula prescribed by him. Moreover, it is evident from Acts 19: 2—5, that the Holy Ghost was named at the baptism of those very persons of whom it is simply said, that they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And in Titus 3: 4—6, where baptism [*λουτρον παλιγγενεσιας* the washing of regeneration] is spoken of, there is an express mention of the Father [*θεος σωτηρ* v. 4], of the Son [*Ιησους Χριστος σωτηρ* v. 6], and of the Holy Ghost [*πνευμα ἁγιον* v. 5]. And Justin[1] states, that it was a custom among the earliest christians, to baptize in the name of the Father and Lord of all things, and of Jesus Christ our Saviour, and of the Holy Ghost. Teller has asserted, that Marcion rejected the baptismal formula; but he does not cite any passage in proof of the fact, and I can find no such passage; but even if the fact could be proved, it would be no argument against the genuineness of this text, for we know that Marcion rejected the whole Gospel of Matthew, (as being the Gospel of a Jewish apostle, and intended originally for the Hebrews,) and of course he rejected the baptismal form found in Matth. 28: 19.[2] "Why (it has been asked)

1 Justini Apologia II, ed. Colon, p. 94.

2 Bekhaus on the genuineness of the baptismal formula, Offenb. 1794.

did the apostles themselves hesitate so much to receive the gentiles to the christian church, and why did others make so much opposition to it (Acts 10: 11), if they had an explicit command of the Lord, to baptize all nations, without any distinction, and of course the gentiles?" To this Bekhaus replies: "Is it not possible for the apostles sometimes to have lost sight of this command of Jesus? Were they not under the influence of a secret national prejudice against the pagans? And may they not have had many conscientious obstacles to contend with in the execution of this command?"

ILLUSTRATION 4.

Divine honour ascribed to Christ in baptism.

The words *εις το ονομα* (Matth. 28 : 19) must properly be translated *in honour of*. For, *ονομα* signifies *honour, dignity:* compare Heb. 1: 4, where *ονομα* is synonymous with *δοξα* and *τιμη* ch. 2: 9. 5: 4. and Is. 48: 9, where the words שֵׁם [name] and תְּהִלָּה [praise] are parallel terms; and 1 Chron. 22 : 5, where תִּפְאָרֶת [glory, splendour] and שֵׁם [renown] are synonymous.[1] Nor will the sense be changed, if with Paulus,[2] we translate these words literally: "*In reference to* the name *υἱος*." In the same manner, also, may the phrases *επι*[3] *τῳ ονοματι* and *εν ονοματι*, be translated; and even the expression *εις Χριστον*, has the same signification. Compare Mic. 4: 5, נֵלֵךְ בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה we will walk in the name of Jehovah. Philip. 2: 10, *εν τῳ ονοματι Ιησου* in honour of Jesus (compare Ps. 63: 5, בְּשִׁמְךָ אֶשָּׂא כַפָּי in thy name will I lift up my hands). Col. 3: 17, *παντα εν*

1 See the Dissert. on the epistle to the Philippians, ch. 2: 9, Note i. and on Heb. 1: 4, Note m.

2 Comment. P. III. p. 920.

3 *επι*=*εις*, comp. Gal. 5: 13. 1 Thess. 4: 7. Eph. 2: 10.

ονοματι κυριου Ιησου (*ποιειτε*) perform all things in the name of the Lord Jesus.[1]

But if baptism is to be performed in honour of Jesus, or the Son; then he is here not regarded merely as a teacher (1 Cor. 10 : 2). Otherwise, baptism in the name of so great a teacher as Paul, could not have been so unbecoming a thing as he himself represents it, 1 Cor. 1: 13, 15. The honour which Christ intends shall be paid him by baptism, is the honour of the *Son*.[2] Christ does indeed require faith in his doctrines (Matth. 28: 19. comp. Acts 18 : 8. 16 : 15). But they are to be received as the doctrines of *the Son*, of him who as *Son*[3] is exalted far above all teachers and messengers of God (1 Cor. 1: 13—15), as the doctrines of the *Redeemer* and *Lord* of the church *ΣΩΤΗΡ και ΚΥΡΙΟΣ*. 1 Cor. 1 : 13, (Christ alone is Lord and Redeemer of the whole church). Rom. 6: 3, (*εις τον θανατον αυτου εβαπτισθημεν* by his death, Christ becomes the *σωτηρ* of the church). Eph. 5:23—26, (by baptism Christ has consecrated the church to himself, as her Head and Redeemer, *κεφαλη της εκκλησιας και σωτηρ του σωματος*). Acts 16: 31—33, (*πιστευσον επι τον κυριον Ιησουν Χριστον—και εβαπτισθη* believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and be baptized). 8: 16, (*βεβαπτισμενοι υπηρχον εις το ονομα του κυριου Ιησου* they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus). Hence it is evident, that the honour which the professors of christianity are commanded to give to Christ in baptism, is certainly a *divine honour* —(*επικαλουμενοις το ονομα του κυριου Ιησου Χριστου*[4] who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. *βαπτισαι, επικα-*

---

1 See Dissert. I, in libros N. T. histor. p. 89. (Opusc. Acad. Vol. III. p. 91.)

2 Matth. 28: 19. Gal. 3: 26. (comp. 4: 4—7). Acts 8: 37.

3 John 1: 18. 3: 31, 11—17. Col. 1: 13—22. Matth. 28: 18, 19. Heb. 1: 2.

4 1 Cor. 1: 13. comp. v. 2.

λεσαμενος το ονομα αυτου[1] to be baptized, calling on his name) —it is such an honour as he had demanded previously to the institution of the ordinance of baptism,[2] and such as had actually been shown him by the apostles before that time; for we are told, προσεκυνησαν αυτῳ,[3] they worshipped him or made obeisance to him, προσκυνησαντες αυτον[4] worshipping him.

As it has been proved (§ 42), that it is our duty to worship Jesus, as being *God* in the highest sense of the word; so the honour shown to the *Son* in baptism, must necessarily be the *same* honour (John 5: 23) as that ascribed to the Father in this ordinance; and therefore *divine honour*, in the strictest sense (1 Pet. 3: 21). Just as circumcision was a declaration, on the part of its subjects, that Jehovah was the God of the posterity of Abraham (Gen. 17: 10—14. comp. 1: 7 &c.), and that they regarded themselves under obligation to live to the honour [בְּשֵׁם in the name, Mic. 4: 5] of Jehovah; so also, by baptism in honour of the Father and the Son (§ 112), its subjects declared that the Father and the Son are the God of the christians, whom they are bound to adore, and to whom they are permitted to have access. This last clause is found in 1 Pet. 3: 21, where the words επερωτημα συνειδησεως αγαθης εις θεον signify, "that baptism procures us an acceptable approach to God with a good conscience, through the resurrection and glory of Christ."

1 Acts 22: 16.

2 John 5: 18—23. 10: 28—33. comp. § 42. Illust. 7, 6.

3 Matth. 28: 17.

4 Luke 24: 52. John 20: 28. See § 42. Illust. 11.

§ 44.

There is a real difference between the Father and the Son; but they are not two Gods.

Independently of the union of the Son with the man Jesus, he is so distinguished (1) from the Father (2), that we are obliged to acknowledge not only a logical but a real distinction between them (3). But as the Scriptures teach, that the Son is God, in the same sense (§ 42) as the Father (4); and yet as there is but one God (§ 28); therefore we must regard this distinction, which has a foundation and is a real distinction, as being such a distinction as does not imply a plurality of Gods (5). The omnipotence of the Son is no other than the omnipotence of the Father, but is one and the same omnipotence (6). The omniscience of the Son and the omniscience of the Father, are one and the same (7). In a word, the *very same* and the entire divine perfection (8) which belongs to the Father, belongs also to the Son (9). Col. 1: 19.

ILLUSTRATION 1.

John 17: 5, *Δοξᾳ ᾗ ειχον προ του τον κοσμον ειναι, παρα σοι* the glory which I had with thee before the world existed. ch. 1: 1, *ὁ λογος ην προς τον θεον* the Word (or Logos) was with God: comp. 1 John 1: 2.

ILLUSTRATION 2.

1 John 1: 2, *ἡ ζωη ἡ αιωνιος, ἡτις ην προς τον πατερα* that life eternal which was with the Father. John 17: 24, *Ηγαπησας με, πατερ, προ καταβολης κοσμου* thou lovedst me, O Father, before the creation of the world. See Comment. on Hebrews, p. 8 &c.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

The distinction between Father and Son is real.

It was not God [ὁ θεος], considered as distinct from the Logos [λογος], but it was that Logos who was *with God* [ὁ λογος ὁ προς τον θεον John 1: 1, 2], that became man [σαρξ εγενετο[1]]. Or, according to 1 John 1: 2, that eternal life which was with the Father, revealed himself to men [ἡ ζωη ἡ αιωνιος, ἥτις ην προς τον πατερα, εφανερωθη ἡμιν]. The phrases, "the Logos was with the Father," "he was in the Father's bosom," "the Father loved him," will not suffer us to conceive of the distinction between the Father and the Logos, as a difference merely of *relation*, sustained by one and the same person. Thus, for example, it would be absurd to say, "God, considered as one who promoted and still promotes the happiness of mankind, through the man Jesus; was with God, considered as the Creator of the world."[2]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

1 Cor. 8: 6, θεος ὁ πατηρ, εξ οὐ τα παντα—εἰς κυριος Ἰησους Χριστος, δι' οὐ τα παντα God the Father, of whom are all things—one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things. John 17: 1, 3. 1: 1, 2. comp. v. 18. 1 John 1: 2.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

The unity of God.

The proposition, "God was the Word [θεος ην ὁ λογος]," rectifies our idea of the phrase preceding it, "the Word was with God;" and guards against such a misconstruction as would contradict the unity of God. The proposition, "the Word was with God," is in precisely the same predicament with the pro-

1 v. 14. comp. v. 18.

2 On the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 471 ff. comp. Flatt, de Deitate Christi, p. 30 &c.

position in dogmatics, "the Father and the Logos are *two persons*." As the distinction between the Logos and the Father, is the only one of its kind, and is a distinction of which we have neither a perfect conception nor an appropriate expression; the sacred writers had to use the language of approximation, or to borrow terms from things which are known to us: such as two men who stand connected, who are intimately united with each other, as a father and his son. Thus, too, the word *person* is only a term of *approximation*: it calls up the idea of two human persons, but is intended to denote a mere *negative* idea, or to deny that the difference is merely a difference of *relation* sustained by a single person.[1] The language of the Augsburg Confession, Art. 1, is this: "Et nomine personae utuntur ex significatione, qua usi sunt in hac causa scriptores ecclesiastici, ut significet non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit;" i. e. and by the word *person*, is meant, not a *part* or a *quality* in another, but that which has itself *a subsistence*; as the word is used by ecclesiastical writers on this subject.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

John 10: 30, *εγω και ὁ πατηρ ἑν εσμεν* I and my Father are one; comp. v. 28, 29.

ILLUSTRATION 7.

The omniscience of the Father and the Son, is one.

John 16: 13, *το πνευμα της αληθειας, ὁσα αν ακουση* (compare 1 Cor. 2: 10, 11) *λαλησει* the Spirit of truth shall speak the things which he shall hear. The same idea is expressed thus in v. 14: *εκ του εμου ληψεται, και αναγγελει ὑμιν*, and in v. 15, it is added, *παντα ὁσα εχει ὁ πατηρ, εμα εστι.*

ILLUSTRATION 8.

The nature of the divine perfection in the Trinity.

By the divine perfection, is here meant the combined whole of all the predicates contained in the idea of God, as they are

[1] On the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 476 &c.

stated above (§ 20); although it is not denied, that the threefold distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the close union of these three with one another, constitute a great perfection of the Deity. Each of these three (persons) sustains a relation to the other two, which is peculiar to himself. But, as to *each* (person) there belongs a certain relation to the others *peculiar to itself*, the perfection of the *divine Being* does not so much consist *exclusively* of the characteristics which are appropriate to *any one* of the three (persons), as e. g. to the Father; but rather in the close *union* of these appropriate characteristics with the peculiar characteristics of the *other two*, e. g. of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. And this divine perfection, which proceeds from the *reciprocal* relation of the three (persons), or which is founded on the indissoluble union of *each* with the other two; *belongs in common* to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.[1]

Dr. Taylor has objected to the doctrine of the Trinity: that "the peculiar character which each of the two persons Father and Son, possesses, must be a *perfection;* and consequently a perfection is lacking to each of them; and hence neither of them can be an infinitely perfect being, i. e. be God." This objection is thus answered by Flatt, de Deitate Christi (p. 97 &c.): "If the expression *divine Being* [*ουσια divina*, God] be taken in a more extended sense, so as to embrace in it what are termed the *personal characteristics;* then it is evident, that all the three persons constitute one divine Being [one Godhead]. But if by *divine Being* [God], we mean the complex of those characteristics and attributes which are ascribed to the Deity or supreme Being by natural religion, and thus exclude the personal characters from our idea of the Deity; then this idea is applicable to all the three persons of the Godhead. And as it cannot be proved that the peculiar characteristics of either of the three

1 Flatt, de Deitate Christi. p. 97.

persons, is a perfection inferior to the peculiar characteristics of the other two persons; it does not follow, that one is less perfect than the others, or that either of these persons is not possessed of divine perfection, in the highest degree.

ILLUSTRATION 9.

As the Father cannot be separated from the Logos, who became man and assumed a human form [*εγω εν τω πατρι, και ὁ πατηρ εν εμοι*[1]]; we may say, that the Father also revealed himself (John 14 : 7 — 9) in the man Jesus, with whom the *λογος θεος* united himself, John 1: 1, 14. 1 John 1: 2.

"The idea commonly attached to the word *person*, is that of an intelligent subsistence, or of a being subsisting by himself, apart from others. This idea, it is evident, cannot with propriety be applied to the relation existing between the Logos and the Father; for the Logos cannot be regarded as existing apart from the Father. They can be considered as two persons, or intelligent subsistences [*ὑποστασεις*], only so far as something (e. g. the incarnation) can be ascribed to one (the Logos), which cannot equally be attributed to the other (the Father)."[2]

---

1 John 14: 10. 10: 28, 30. comp. the work on the Object of the Gospel of John, p. 196, 478 ff.

[2 On this mysterious and important doctrine, which is so intimately interwoven with the whole economy of redemption, it is important to the theological student to be habituated to the most rigid propriety and precision of language. And as it may be interesting as well as instructive to the critical reader, to have access to the phraseology of distinguished divines on this subject; I shall add some brief extracts from the systems of the most distinguished theologians. I select only from the works of Lutherans, because they are most rarely accessible to the American student:—And (1) from the illustrious M. Chemnitz, whom Tribbechovius terms, "Theologorum facile princeps." He says (in his work, "De duabus naturis in Christo"): "Essentia divina praedicatur de Patre, de Filio, et de Spiritu Sancto, non ut genus de speciebus, nec ut species de individuis, nec ut totum de partibus, sed alio quodam ineffabili et incomprehensibili modo. Hypostases vero seu personae Trinitatis omnes unum sunt."—(2) Dr. Finck, who lived about the close of the 16th century, a-

§ 45.

Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

Just as the Son, who revealed himself to the world in the man Jesus, is joined with the Father in the formula of baptism (§ 43. Illust. 4), because,

---

bout forty years after the death of Chemnitz, says: "Gott Vater, Sohn, und Heiliger Geist: Der Vater der einen Sohn von Ewigkeit zu seinem Ebenbilde gezeugt, der Sohn so vom Vater gebohren ist, und der Heilige Geist, der vom Vater und Sohn auf unerforschliche Weise ausgehet." (Loci Commun. p. 107). — (3) William Lyser, Doctor and Professor of Divinity in the University of Wittenberg, says: "Trinitas est unitas in essentia trium personarum—Unitas essentiae distinctionem personarum non tollit, nec distinctio personarum unitatem essentiae multiplicat." (Systema thetico-exegeticum, p. 130, edit. J. G. Neumanni, 1680). — (4) M. Dav. Hollatzius (Examen Theolog. Acroamatic. a most excellent work, which the pious author, instead of dedicating to the illustrious personages of his age, formally inscribed "To the Triune God," in terms of the most ardent and intense devotion, on p. 311) says: "Augustissimum venerandae Trinitatis mysterium, modo simplissimo et planissimo traditurus ostendat, quod Deus unus sit: Quod unus Deus sit Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus: Quod alius sit Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus Sanctus: Quod Pater in aeternum generet Filium, Filius ab aeterno a Patre sit genitus, Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio procedat." — (4) The indefatigable and learned Dr. Buddeus, successively the ornament of Cobourg, of Halle, and of Jena Universities, says: "Observandum, Scripturam sacram diserte et luculenter docere, I. Patrem a Filio, Filium a Patre, et ab utroque Spiritum Sanctum realiter differre, ut alius sit Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus Sanctus:—II. Non solum Patrem, sed etiam Filium et Spiritum Sanctum esse verum et aeternum Deum:—III. Nec tamen tres esse Deos, sed Deum unum." (Theol. Dogmat. p. 266):—(5) Dr. S. J. Baumgarten, a most profound divine, who might not unaptly be styled the Lutheran Edwards, says: "Summa doctrinae de Trinitate huc redit, ut credamus, I. Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum esse verum Deum; singulosque ad unum Deum ita pertinere, ut unus Deus sit Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus:—II. hunc Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum vere differre, ut supposita intelligentia seu personas:—III. has tres personas habere eandem essentiam, sibique invicem non solum similes, verum etiam aequales simul esse:—et IV. demum, has tres personas non essentiali aliqua re ad Deum in se considerata pertinente differe, sed actibus internis et exinde ortis relationibus, quibus efficiatur, ut unaquaeque sit alia a reliquis, non tamen aliud quid." (Evangelische Glaubenslehre, Vol. I. p. 448).—(6) We shall close this

although there is a distinction between him and the Father, he is nevertheless one and the same God with the Father; so also is the Holy Spirit, in the same formula (1) joined with the Father and the Son, because, although there is a similar distinction between him and the Father and the Son, yet he is united in the closest manner with both (2), and is one and the same God with them, to whom the subjects of baptism addressed themselves (1 Pet. 3: 21), and to whom they pay adoration. There are other passages in which the Holy Spirit is either distinguished from the Father and the Son (3), or represented as one with God (4). And the same omniscience is specifically ascribed to him (5), which is attributed to the Father and the Son (6).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

2 Cor. 13: 13, *ἡ χαρις του κυριου Ιησου Χριστου, και ἡ αγαπη του θεου, και ἡ κοινωνια του πνευματος ἁγιου* the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. 12: 4—6, *το αυτο πνευμα—ὁ αυτος κυριος—ὁ αυτος θεος* the same Spirit—the same Lord—the same God. 1 Pet. 1 : 2. comp. Jude 20, 21. On the text

note, with the definition of that luminous and truly philosophic divine, Dr. Mosheim, whose Elementa theologiae dogmaticae is one of the most scientifically systematic and lucid works which Europe has produced on the subject of dogmatics: "Decet enim Revelatio, in Deo tametsi simpliciter unus sit, esse tamen partitionem quendam, quae tamen ternarium numerum non excedat, et realiter in essentia divina distingui debere Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Theologi hoc dogma his verbis enuntiare solent: In una essentia divina tres sunt personae consubstantiales, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.—Propositio haec, tametsi generatim capiatur et intelligatur, haud tamen demonstrari, sed solo testimonio divino firmari potest, neque omni ex parte capitur et intelligitur." Vol. I. p. 307, 308, ed. 3d. See also the discriminating remarks of Morus on this subject. Epitome Theol. Christianae, p. 59—71, ed. 4th, 1799. S.]

1 John 5: 7. See Tübing. Gehlehrte Anzeigen ;[1] Griesbach's Remarks on Hezel's Vindication of 1 John 5: 7, Giessen, 1794, (contained also in Hezel's "Schriftforscher) ;"[2] Griesbach's Novum Testamentum,[3] appendix Diatribe in locum 1 John 5: 7, 8. Mori Praelectt. exeg. in tres Johannis epistolas.[4]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

John 15: 26, *ὁ παρακλητος, ὁν εγω πεμψω παρα του πατρος* the Paraclete (or Monitor) whom I will send from the Father. Matth. 10: 20, *το πνευμα του πατρος* the Spirit of the Father. Rom. 8: 11. comp. 6: 4. Rom. 8: 9 &c. Gal. 4: 6, *εξαπεστειλεν ὁ θεος το πνευμα του υἱου αυτου* God sent forth the Spirit of his Son.

ILLUSTRATION 3.

John 14 : 16, *αλλον παρακλητον δωσει ὑμιν* sc. *ὁ πατηρ* the Father will give you another Monitor. 15 : 26. 16: 13—15. On the personality of the Holy Spirit, the reader may consult Schmidt's "Christliche Religionslehre ;"[5] Schott's Epitome Theol. Christ. Dogm. (p. 182) ; and his Preacher's Journal for the promotion of piety.[6]

ILLUSTRATION 4.

1 Cor. 2: 11. In this passage, the relation of the Spirit of God to God, is represented as analogous to the relation subsisting between the spirit of man and man. Compare 1 Cor. 3: 16. and 6: 19. (comp. 3: 17, *το σωμα ὑμων ναος του εν ὑμιν ἁγιου πνευματος εστι—ναος του θεου εστε ὑμεις* your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit in you—ye are the temple of God.) Compare also 2 Cor. 6: 16. In Acts 5: 3, 4, the phrases *ψευσασθαι το πνευμα ἁγιον* and *ψευσασθαι τῳ θεῳ* are synonymous.

---

1 No. 72, for 1785. 2 Vol. II. P. III.
3 Vol. II. 2d ed. Halle, 1806. 4 p. 68—77.
5 p. 105, Giessen, 1808. 6 Vol. II. P. I, Leipsic, 1811. No. 3. p. 110.

ILLUSTRATION 5.

Another divine attribute, namely unlimited power, is attributed to the Spirit in 1 Cor. 12: 8, 9, 11, *παντα ταυτα ενεργει το πνευμα, διαιρουν ἑκαστῳ καθως βουλεται* all these are wrought by the Spirit, apportioning to each one as he will.

ILLUSTRATION 6.

1 Cor. 2: 10, *το πνευμα παντα ερευνᾳ, και τα βαθη του θεου* the Spirit discerns all things, even the secret purposes of God. The whole passage from v. 9—13, as Morus says, attributes to the Spirit, "Scire consilia Dei, ei soli nota, aliis omnibus utique ignota [1] [to know these counsels of God, which are known only to God and are unknown to all others]." In John 16: 13—15, the same knowledge is ascribed to the Spirit, as to the Father and Son, even a knowledge of future things [*των ερχομενων*].

§ 46.

The nature of the distinction between Father, Son and Holy Spirit, can neither be explained nor expressed by words.[2]

Accordingly, we represent to ourselves these three distinct (persons), Father, Son and Holy Spirit, as one God; and worship them as such. But at the same time we must confess, that, just as many

[1] Morus, Epitome Theologiae Christ. p. 66. note 1.

[2] On the words *persona*, *ὑποστασις*, *προσωπον*, *ουσια*, *ὁμοουσιος*, &c. as applied to the Divine Being, some interesting discussion may be found in Professor Stuart's Letters to Wm. E. Channing (p. 22—30, ed. 3d); in Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre (Vol. I. p. 429—434); and Semler's Einleitung (Vol. I. 197, 229. III. 314—316). Much was said, about the time of the Reformation, concerning the tendency of these terms to lead to tritheism; and among the advocates for their expulsion from

other things, especially such as relate to the Godhead, transcend the powers of our comprehension; so also are we unable to comprehend the nature and mode of the distinction which subsists between the Son, who became man, and the Father, by whom he is "well beloved;" or the nature and mode of the distinction between the Holy Spirit on the one hand, and the Father and Son, from whom the Spirit was sent and proceeded forth to the apostles, on the other (John 15: 26); and that therefore we are unable fully to express this distinction by any word or phrase (1). It is this inability to comprehend the precise nature of the distinction between Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which renders it impossible for us to explain how this distinction coincides with the unity of God, a doctrine to which we inflexibly adhere: [but, on the other hand, this same inability also renders it equally impossible for any one to prove, that the unity of God is inconsistent with this distinction.] (2).

ILLUSTRATION 1.

On the incomprehensibility of the distinction in the persons of the Trinity, the reader may consult the work (of Dr. Storr) on the Object of the Gospel and epistles of John;[1] Griesbach's

theological disquisition, might be mentioned a number of the first divines of the age, not excepting Hunnius and even Luther himself. Yet, to prevent the charge of Arianism or Socinianism, which he knew his enemies would eagerly seize the least pretext to prefer against them, Luther yielded to Melancthon's wishes, and in the Augsburg Confession, the doctrine of the Trinity is couched in the old scholastic terms. On this subject, the sentiments of the ablest divines of the present day have been thus expressed by the Rev. Dr. Miller: "We found it in use; and not knowing a better term for the purpose intended, we have cheerfully adopted and continue to use it still. We by no means understand it, however, in a gross or carnal sense." S.]

1 p. 470. (see above § 44. Illust. 5).

Introduction to the study of popular Dogmatics (§ 62—64); Schlegel's "Doctrine of the Trinity in God, again considered;"[1] Augustine, de Trinitate;[2] [Professor Stuart, On the Divinity of Christ;[3] and Dr. Miller's Letters on Unitarianism].[4]

The doctrine of the Trinity, in the ecclesiastical terminology of dogmatics, is expressed in the following terms: (1) "In una indivisibili *Essentia* [*ουσια*], subsistunt tres *Personae* consubstantiales [coessentiales *ὁμοουσιοι*], Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus.—(2) Tres in Divinitate Personae vere et realiter differunt."

[On the important and difficult subject of this Illustration, the translator cannot deny himself the pleasure of inserting some of the remarks of Professor Stuart. The excellence of the quotation will render superfluous any apology for its length. S.

"What then, you doubtless will ask, is that distinction in the Godhead, which the word *person* is meant to designate? I answer without hesitation, that I do not know. The *fact* that a distinction exists, is what we aver; the definition of that distinction, is what I shall by no means attempt. By what shall I, or can I define it? What simile drawn from created objects, which are necessarily derived and dependent, can illustrate the mode of existence in that Being, who is underived, independent, unchangeable, infinite, eternal? I confess myself unable to advance a single step here in explaining what the distinction is. *I receive the* FACT *that it exists, simply because I believe that the Scriptures reveal the* FACT. And if the Scriptures do reveal the fact, that there are three *persons* in the Godhead, (in the sense explained;) that there is a distinction which affords ground for

1 Pt. II. sect. II. p. 89.

2 Lib. V. cap. 9. Opp. Basil, 1543, T. III. p. 321.

3 Letters to Mr. Channing, on the divinity of Christ, p. 35—38, 3d ed.

4 See Letters on Unitarianism &c. by Dr. Miller, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, p. 70—88.

the appellations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which lays the foundation for the application of the personal pronouns, *I, thou, he;* which renders it proper, to speak of *sending and being sent;* of Christ *being with God, being in his bosom,* and other things of the like nature; and yet, that the divine nature belongs to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; then it is, like every other fact revealed, to be received simply on the credit of divine revelation.

"Is there any more difficulty in understanding the fact, that there is a distinction in the Godhead, than there is in understanding that God possesses an underived existence? With what shall we compare such existence? All other beings are *derived;* and, of course, there is no object in the universe with whose existence it can be compared. To define it then, is beyond our reach. We can approximate towards a conception of it, merely by negatives. We deny that the divine existence has any author or cause; and when we have done this, we have not defined it, but simply said that a certain thing *does not* belong to it. Here we must rest. The boundaries of human knowledge can never be extended beyond this.

"The distinction in the Godhead, which I have now mentioned, I ought to say here, we do not, and cannot consider as a mere subject of speculation, which has little or no concern with ardent piety, or the best hopes of the Christian. We believe that some of the most interesting and endearing exhibitions of the divine character, are founded upon it and connected with it; and that corresponding duties are urged upon us, and peculiar hopes excited, and consolations administered by it.

"In regard to this distinction, we say, *It is not a mere distinction of attributes, of relation to us, of modes of action, or of relation between attributes and substance or essence,* so far as they are known to us. We believe the Scriptures justify us in these

negations. But *here* we leave the subject. We undertake, (at least, the Trinitarians of our country, with whom I am acquainted, undertake,) *not* at all to describe *affirmatively* the distinction in the Godhead. When you will give me an affirmative description of *underived existence*, I may safely engage to furnish you with one of *person* in the Trinity. You do not reject the belief of self-existence, merely because you cannot *affirmatively define* it; neither do we of a distinction in the Godhead, because we cannot *affirmatively define* it.

"I may ask, moreover, What is the *eternity* of God? You answer by telling me, that there never was a time, when he did not exist, and never can be one, when he will not exist. True; but then, what was *time*, before the planetary system, which measures it, had an existence? And what will *time* be, when these heavens and this earth shall be blotted out? Besides, passing over this difficulty about time, you have only given a negative description of God's eternity; you *deny* certain things of him, and then aver that he is *eternal*. Yet because you cannot affirmatively describe eternity, you would not refuse to believe that God is *eternal*. Why then should I reject the belief of a distinction in the Godhead, because I cannot affirmatively define it?

"I do not admit therefore, that we are exposed justly to be taxed with mysticism, and absurdity, when we aver that there is a distinction in the Godhead, which we are utterly unable to define. I am aware, indeed, that a writer some time since composed and published, in a periodical work then edited at Cambridge, a piece in which he laboured, with no small degree of acuteness, to show that no man can believe a proposition, the terms of which are unintelligible, or which he does not understand. His object in doing this, appears to have been, to fix upon a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, the charge of ab-

surdity. But it seems to me, the whole argument of that piece is founded on a confusion of two things, which are in themselves very diverse; viz. *terms* which are *unintelligible*, and *things* which are *undefinable*. You believe in the *fact*, that the divine existence is without cause; you understand the *fact* that God exists uncaused, but you cannot define underived existence. I believe, on the authority of the Scriptures, that there is a real distinction in the Godhead; but I cannot define it. Still, the proposition that there is a *real distinction*, is just as intelligible, as the one that God is self existent. A multitude of propositions, respecting diverse subjects, resemble these. We affirm, that gravitation brings a body thrown into the air, down to the earth. The *fact* is perfectly intelligible. The terms are perfectly understood, so far as they are the means of describing this fact. But then, what is gravitation? An affirmative definition cannot be given, which is not a mere exchange of synonymes. Nor can any comparison define it; for to what shall we liken it?"[1]]

ILLUSTRATION 2.

This distinction cannot be proved inconsistent with the divine unity.

The very same cause, which renders it impracticable for us to prove the harmony between this distinction and the divine unity, also renders it impossible to prove, that the assertion of a threefold distinction in the one divine Being, involves a contradiction. "Whenever we find a real contradiction between this distinction and the unity of the divine Being, it only follows, that in every such instance, we have an erroneous idea of the internal distinction in the Godhead, or it may be, an incorrect idea of the one divine Being himself; and from this erroneous

1 Stuart's Letters to Wm. E. Channing, p. 35—38, 3d ed. See also Storr's Sonn-und Festtags-Predigten, Vol. I. No. 35, Tüb. 1806.

idea of ours, the inconsistency wholly results."[1] Flatt, in his work de Deitate Christi,[2] reduces this doctrine to the Algebraic universal proposition, which admits of no dispute: "Subjecta *A* et *B* (et *D*) ita ad se invicem referuntur, ut commune quidem idem numero *C* habeant, sed charactere quodam *X* inter se differant [The relation of the subjects *A*, *B*, (and *D*) to each other is such, that they are numerically the same, in regard to a certain something termed *C*; but they differ from one another, in a certain property called *X*].

"As for the doctrine of the Trinity, the impossibility of giving a positive definition of the distinction between Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is no sufficient reason for denying the distinction itself, of which the Bible assures us. For, reason when left to herself, sets before us objects, concerning which we indeed know *that* they exist [το ὅτι]; but concerning whose nature, we have no positive knowledge. We can only distinguish between them and some false representations, or determine what they are not; but of their intrinsic nature, *how* they are [το πως], we have not the slightest knowledge."[3]

---

1 See the work of Dr. Storr, on the Object of the Gospel and epistles of John, p. 475 &c.

2 § XIV.

3 Dissert. on "Kant's Philosophische Religionslehre," p. 7. On the idea of the Trinity advanced in Daub's Theologumenis, Heidelberg, 1805, the reader may consult Gabler's Journal for select theological literature, Vol. V. p. 523 &c. 531 &c.

APPENDIX

BY THE TRANSLATOR.

ON THE RELATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY TO REASON.

On the important subject of the relation of the doctrine of the Trinity to reason, the translator begs leave to subjoin a few remarks. All that can well be known on this subject from reason, may perhaps, when reduced to its elementary principles, be embraced in the following propositions; which, it is also humbly conceived, contain satisfactory solutions of the difficulties connected with this view of the subject.

PROP. 1. *A divine revelation cannot contain any thing which is contrary to the plain and indisputable dictates of reason.*

By "plain indisputable dictates of reason," we mean those propositions in all the various departments of truth—mathematical, moral, &c., the evidence of which is such, that when fairly presented to our view, the constitution of our mind compels us to believe them. Such are all the selfevident truths, (sometimes called intuitive truths, or first truths, or constitutional judgments,) and all truths derived from them, the evidence of which is so strong that we are compelled to yield our assent. Such are the derived moral truths embraced in natural religion, that God is extremely powerful and intelligent (but not that he is omnipotent or omniscient). Now, as these propositions are the natural and legitimate product of the structure of our mental nature, they must be regarded as the instructions of the Creator, from whom our peculiar mental constitution is derived. Hence, if they were contradicted by his instructions in revelation, the Creator would contradict in revelation what he teaches in nature, that is, would contradict himself; which is absurd: therefore *a divine revelation cannot contain any thing which is contrary to the plain indisputable dictates of reason.* In connexion with this principle, there is no dispute, unless it be alleged that we teach the ex-

istence of three Gods, and that the unity of God is a plain, incontrovertible dictate of reason, which would be contradicted by tritheism. To this we reply, *First:* Even if we did teach the existence of three Gods, there would be no dispute relative to this principle; for, the unity of God, can by no means be made indisputably evident from reason. Unity of *design* may be rendered in a very high degree evident, but unity of person (in the popular sense) cannot. But, *Secondly:* It is not the case, that Trinitarians believe in three Gods, as may be seen by a reference to their respective creeds, in all of which the belief in one God is as explicitly stated as it possibly could be. If it be still alleged, that though Trinitarians do not profess tritheism, yet their doctrine inevitably leads to the belief of three gods; then this objection is answered under the following propositions.

PROP. 2. *A divine revelation cannot contain any proposition which demonstrably involves self-contradiction.*

It will be admitted that truth is always harmonious, and that no two truths of any kind are contradictory, i. e. subversive, of each other; neither are the relations of truth. A contradictory proposition is that, one idea of which is manifestly subversive of the other, and the ideas of which, the constitution of our minds compels us to believe cannot both be true: such a proposition is this, "a triangle is a square." But the Creator has so formed us, that of two propositions which are contradictory, if the first be clearly proved to be true, we are compelled by the constitution of our mental nature to believe the second false. For, as they are subversive of each other, if we suppose the second also true, it would destroy the first; so that the first would have to be (true) and not to be (true) at the same time; which is contrary to an intuitive or self-evident truth. Therefore, as God is the Author of our mental nature, it is God who compels us to disbelieve one of two contradictory propositions; and hence, if his revelation contained any such propositions, he would himself compel us to disbelieve part of his own revelation. But God's object in giving a revelation is, that it should be believed; therefore he would not give a revelation and insert propositions in it which he compels us to disbelieve, that is, contradictory propositions: *therefore a revelation coming from God, cannot contain propositions which demonstrably involve self-contradiction.* In reference to this proposition, it has been alledged by some, that the doctrine of the Trinity involves such

a contradiction. They reason thus: The idea of one and the idea of three are contradictory and subversive of one another, so that the same thing cannot be one and three at the same time. But Trinitarians affirm that God is one and three at the same time; therefore they affirm what cannot be true, i. e. a contradictory proposition. But the major proposition is stated in a loose and indefinite manner, and is not true in every instance; for a triangle is one and three at the same time, when considered as one among many figures, and in reference to its sides. In order to be true, that is, admissible, the major proposition must run thus: "It is impossible for the same thing to be 1 and 3 in the *same respect* at the same time." To this we assent; but in this form, the doctrine of the Trintiry is by no means embraced under it; for it need not be told to the intelligent reader, that Trinitarians unanimously deny that God is one and three *in the same respect*. They expressly teach, that God is one in one respect, and three in another respect. The first respect they denominate by the term *essence*, and the second by the term *persons*. Therefore, as the Trinitarian proposition is not embraced in the major, the conclusion of course is not applicable to it.

But it has been objected, that some of the phraseology of Trinitarians, expressive of the reciprocal relation between the persons of the Godhead, involves contradiction. Those, who advance the objection, reason thus: The one God is said to be threefold in his persons; but each person is the one God; therefore each person is threefold. But the major is not clearly stated. The idea intended is this, "God who is one (i. e. God in the respect in which unity is affirmed of him, namely, in *essence*) is three in person (i. e. in another respect, called *person*); but each person (i. e. God, in each of the respects called *persons*) is the one God (i. e. is God, in the respect in which unity is affirmed of him, namely, in *essence*): — But this minor is not true; therefore the conclusion is a *non sequitur*." In order to cover the conclusion, the syllogism must stand thus: "God in (*essence*) the sense in which he is one, is also three (in the same sense, *essence*); but each of these three (*persons*) is God in the sense in which he is one (in *essence*); therefore each of these three (*persons*) is three in the sense (in *essence*) in which God is one." But it need scarce be mentioned that we deny the major and minor, as strenuously as any other persons can: for we deny that he is one and three *in the same sense*. If it be

alleged, that explanations of the distinction in the Supreme Being have sometimes been attempted, and from these and the language of Trinitarians in general, it is evident that they understand the terms *essence* and *person*, in a manner which necessarily involves self-contradiction; it must be admitted, that this has unfortunately sometimes been the case. But this will not be surprising when we recollect the inexplicability of the divine nature, and the high degree of mental discipline which is requisite, before men can clearly discern the proper limits of the human understanding. Nor are the divines of the present day responsible for any phraseology but their own; and we believe they uniformly disavow the terms and ideas objected to. They believe that God is one in one respect, and three in another respect. To the respect in which he is one, they give the name *essence;* the other respect, in which he is three, they designate by the term *person*. But in so doing they do not intend to convey any positive ideas of the several respects to which they are applied. They are to be considered as equivalent to the Algebraic letters *X* and *Y*, which stand for unknown quantities or properties; as if it had been said, "in *X* respect God is one, and in *Y* respect he is three:" and thus the propositions are no more contradictory than if we were to say, "a triangle in *X* respect (i. e. considered as a figure) is one, and in *Y* respect (in reference to its sides) it is three;" or, that "man in *X* respect (in reference to his soul and body) is two fold, and in *Y* respect (considered as an individual of our race) is one." We do not forget that the triunity of the triangle results from its material properties, inasmuch as, like all matter, it consists of parts; and that God is without parts [ens simplicissimum]: but we do not adduce these examples to prove from analogy either the truth or the possibility of the Trinitarian doctrine; its truth must rest on the divine record, and if that is established its possibility necessarily follows. We only state these as several unconnected propositions, but similarly constructed and of course equally void of contradiction. Moreover, as we do not define the distinction in the Deity at all, it cannot be urged that we define it to be such as depends on parts; hence, the absence of parts in God, cannot be alleged as an argument against the distinction which is negatively proposed. For, it is impossible that there should be contradiction between terms the ideas of which are all strictly negative, and do not imply, by inference either more or less remote, any idea of a positive nature.

PROP. 3. *A divine revelation might naturally be expected to teach truths untaught by reason.*

That, after all our advances in knowledge, there always have been and still are many truths physical and moral, connected with our world, which are unknown to us, will be admitted. Hence, in giving us a revelation, it was at least possible for God to teach us truths unknown to reason. But that if he gave a revelation, he actually would teach such truths (either to enforce truths previously known, or unconnected with them), is evident from the nature of the case. If God gives a revelation, such a revelation must have been necessary, or not. If it was not necessary, then God gave a revelation unnecessarily. But God does nothing unnecessarily; therefore, if he gave a revelation it was necessary. Now, the revelation which it was necessary for God to give, must either contain some truths or relations of truths unknown to us before, or not. But if it contains none but such as we knew before, it was unnecessary for God to give it. But it was necessary, or he would not have given it; therefore a revelation from God might naturally be expected to teach truths unknown to us before, truths untaught by reason. Such are the sanctions of his law, the doctrines concerning angels, the resurrection of the body, and the Trinity.

PROP. 4. *We have no reason to expect, that our limited capacities should be able to comprehend fully the modes and circumstances and relations of those truths which reason could not teach, and which are known only by revelation, any more than of those truths known without revelation; but it is natural to expect that the contrary would be the case.*

It is evident that the adorable Author of our being has fixed with the utmost precision, the limits of the human understanding. Our minds are so constructed, that whatever is necessary for the practical purposes of life, we can know, and know with certainty. But in the whole store of our knowledge, whatever be its nature, or whatever the subject to which it relates, there is not a single particular to which, in some of its circumstances or relations, there is not some mystery, something inexplicable attached. The fact of the attraction of gravitation we know; and it is upon the certainty and uniformity of this fact, that all its boundless utility in the mechanical arts, as well as in the explanation of the phenomena of physical nature, depends. But where is the mechanic, or where the philosopher, who can ex-

plain the cause or the mode of operation of this wonderful principle? The fact of the tendency of the magnetic needle to the poles, is known; and relying on its certainty, and on the uniformity of the other laws of nature, the mariner confides his all to the bark, which gravitation keeps upon the surface of the water, and spreading his canvass to the winds of heaven, steers with security his adventurous course through every clime. Yet who can explain the cause of this wonderful phenomenon, or the mode of its operation? But let it not be supposed that the nature and relations of these general and important facts are peculiarly mysterious. Mystery equally profound and equally great, is no less a concomitant of every object around us, even of such as appear the most trifling or the best understood. Let the pen with which I am writing demonstrate this truth. Who can tell how (in obedience to the divine will) it grew to its slender form? or what philosopher can explain the nature of that something, (called by men cohesive attraction,) by which its particles are held together? In short, in our present state we are a mystery to ourselves; and every object around us presents abundant evidence that the Creator has definitely fixed the limits of our knowledge, and told us, Hitherto shalt thou come, and here shall the proud range of thine intellect be stayed. Therefore

It will be admitted, that either the intrinsic nature, or the mode of subsistence, or some of the relations or circumstances of every thing or truth connected with the present world, is incomprehensible to us.

And it will be admitted, that the incomprehensibility of those modes and circumstances of truths which are incomprehensible to us, arises either from their intrinsic nature, or from the limited character of our faculties; and that it is probably impossible for God himself to enable us to understand some of them without first enlarging our faculties.

And it will be admitted, that we know less of the future world than of the present, and that the little knowledge which we have concerning it, is in its relations more enveloped in mystery. Hence it follows, *a fortiori*, that if it is impossible for our present limited capacities to comprehend the modes and circumstances of the truths of the present world, which are less mysterious; much less can they comprehend those of the truths relating to the future world, which are more mysterious.

Again: The same relation between a certain truth which was unknown and other truths and principles which were known

and understood, which led the mind to the discovery of the unknown truth, also implies some similarity or analogy or connexion with the truth which was known and understood; by virtue of which the truth discovered is also at least in some degree intelligible. And the same relation between the faculties of the the human mind and an unknown truth, by virtue of which there was a peculiar adaptation in the mind for the discovery of that truth, rather than of others which it never could discover, and for a knowledge of which we are indebted to revelation alone, also implies a peculiar adaptation in the mind to understand the truth discovered. Thus the fact that the illustrious Kepler was able to comprehend those principles, a knowledge of which led him to the discovery that the orbits of the planets are not spherical but elliptic, also implied his ability to comprehend the properties and relations of an ellipsis; and his comprehension of these and of the related truths, conducted him to the additional discovery that the planets, in their revolutions, describe equal areas in equal times. The acquaintance of the great Sir Isaac Newton with the revolutions of the heavenly bodies, and those enlarged views of the solar system as one connected whole, which led him to the thought that the same principle which brought the apple to the ground, might (as it reached without any sensible diminution to the summit of the highest mountains) as well extend to the moon and other planets, implied in him an ability to comprehend the effects of this principle when once the thought had been started. Similar to this is the case of those truths, relative to the existence and nature of God, which reason teaches. Thus, it is an undisputed principle, that the framer of a machine, in the structure of which there are evidently design and adaptation to an end, must be an intelligent being. And perceiving the manifest design and adaptation in the constrution of the universe, men may justly infer the intelligence of the Author of it. Now, the relation between the doctrine that God is an intelligent Being and the principle that every machine manifesting design and adaptation must have an intelligent being for its author, implies some analogy or similarity or connexion between them, from which it results that as the principle is intelligible, the doctrine which flows from it will be so also, at least in some degree; and that the same adaptation of the human faculties and knowledge of related truths which led to the discovery of the doctrine, or which enables us to perceive evidences of its truth, also implies, at least in some degree, the ability to

comprehend the truth discovered. From these considerations it necessarily follows, that we have reason to believe that those truths which are contained in a divine revelation and are also taught by reason, are in their nature less incomprehensible and less involved in mysterious relations, than those between which and the knowledge obtained by our natural faculties, there is no such analogy or connexion as could lead to their discovery, or could afford evidence of their truth after they are revealed. Hence, it follows that among the truths contained in a divine revelation, the mode and relations of those which were taught by revelation alone [articuli puri] will probably be more mysterious than of those, of which the light of nature affords us some knowledge. And hence it follows, in reference to the Deity, that as the mode and many of the relations of those truths relative to the nature of the divine Being which are taught by reason, are absolutely incomprehensible, it may naturally be expected that if any additional truths are revealed to us on this subject, their mode and relations would be still more mysterious; inasmuch as they would have no analogy or similarity to the knowledge which we possess.

Finally; in reference to those truths relative to the divine Being (such as omniscience, knowledge of future contingencies and the like) which are taught by reason, we find that those relations of them which were incomprehensible by the light of reason, are just as incomprehensible after the truths to which they refer have been also taught by revelation, as they were before. But if it were the intention of God, that we should fully comprehend all the relations of the truths contained in his revelation, he would at least have perfected our knowledge of the relations of those truths which even reason had taught us to understand. But this he has not done. Therefore it is not his intention, and we have no ground to expect, that our limited capacities should be able to comprehend the modes and circumstances and relations of those truths which reason could not teach, and which are known only by revelation, any more than of those truths known without revelation; but on the contrary, it is natural to expect, that their relations would be still more enveloped in mystery.

PROP. 5. *We can believe, and it is our duty to believe, those truths of revelation which are untaught by reason, as far as they are revealed, i. e. made comprehensible, but no farther; for this is impossible, and the Scriptures do not require it.*

It will be admitted, that almost every thing in which we believe (taking the word in its popular latitude) is in some respect or other inexplicable. We believe that we exist (without requiring the famous argument of Des Cartes to convince us of the fact); yet there are a thousand things relative to the mode of our existence which we cannot understand. We believe the existence of all the external objects of which we obtain a knowledge through the medium of our senses; yet relative to every one, it were easy to propose some interrogatory to which no man could give a satisfactory reply. We believe in all those relations of visible objects and of abstract truths, the evidence of which appears to the human mind satisfactory; yet what reflecting mind does not know, that mystery envelopes all those particulars of our faith? The chymist believes in all those beautiful affinities of his science, the existence of which experience has taught him; and the lover of natural philosophy, in general believes in all those properties of matter and laws of the material world, of which observation or credible testimony assures him; but would he be entitled to the name of a philosopher, who (with our present scanty knowedge) should pretend that he fully comprehended the mode of operation and the relations of any one of these principles or laws? We believe that God is uncreated; but how any being could exist without having at some time or other begun to exist, who can comprehend? Some of the ancient philosophers who received not the revelation, have inculcated the omniscience of God in very pleasing and explicit terms. Seneca the moralist, in admonishing his fellow men not to believe that they had escaped punishment because their crimes were concealed from the view of mortals, remarks,"nam ille in cujus conspectu vivimus scit omnia, he in whose presence we live (i. e. God) knows all things." The same proposition is believed alike by Deist, by Unitarian, and by the disciple of that glorious Redeemer to whom his apostle said, "Lord, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee." But is not the mode of the divine omniscience equally incomprehensible to all? Since, then, it is a fact that all men positively do believe a thousand propositions, when they cannot comprehend the mode and relations of the truths asserted in them; it necessarily follows that we can do it: which was the first point to be proved.

Again: as it will be admitted that we are under obligation to believe the whole of a revelation which has been proved divine, it follows that it is our duty to believe every part; and conse-

quently those parts also which contain truths or propositions, the mode of which or many of the relations of which are incomprehensible to us: and this was the second point.

Finally: to say that we believe in a proposition, when we have no idea of the truth intended to be affirmed in it, is an absurdity; the thing is impossible, and cannot be a duty. By belief in a proposition, we mean the judgment of the mind that the idea affirmed by the terms of the proposition is true. Hence, to say that we believe in a proposition which we do not understand, is to say that we judge some particular idea to be true, but we do not know what idea. For we believe, either from evidence presented to our minds, or upon the testimony of one in whom we confide. We can not believe in an unintelligible proposition, from its own evidence; for the evidence of the truth of an idea must be found in its relations to other truths or principles which are more evident; but if we do not even know what the idea in question is, much less can we know its relations. Hence it is impossible to believe in an unintelligible proposition, from its own evidence; for evidence unknown to the mind can have no influence in producing belief of any kind. Nor is it possible to believe in an unintelligible proposition, on the testimony of any being whatever. For it is impossible, by the laws of our mental nature, to judge that an idea is true or not, unless we know what the idea is. If an unintelligible proposition were contained in a divine revelation, we might express the general judgment, that, as it is of divine origin, it contains a truth which it would convey to a being that could understand it, whatever that might be, for God cannot lie. But we could not believe that any particular idea is true, on the authority of such a proposition, until we knew that it is contained in it. Hence it is evident that a belief in an unintelligible proposition, is a contradiction in terms and impossible in the nature of things. And as God will not require what he has made it impossible for us to perform, and as he so formed the human mind, that we cannot believe what we cannot understand; therefore it is not our duty to believe any unintelligible proposition: which was the last point to be proved.

In reference to this proposition, it has been alledged that Trinitarians acknowledge their inability to comprehend the doctrine of the Trinity, and yet profess to believe it. This objection also arises from want of precision, which may be chargable perhaps as well to some of the orthodox as to their opponents. But it is easily solved, the writer thinks, by an applica-

tion of the preceding remarks. The point at issue is not whether the few general ideas which the scriptures reveal, relative to the distinction in the Deity, are most closely connected with mystery, whether they are related to ideas which reason cannot discover and which God has not revealed; for this is granted, and it has been proved, in the first point of this proposition, that this is no bar to our believing those truths which are revealed. But the question is, are those propositions relative to this subject, which Trinitarians profess to believe, unintelligible? Those who differ from the Trinitarians, seem to confound those views of this doctrine which are revealed in Scripture and are intelligible, with the relations of these views or truths and their mode of subsistence, concerning which the holy volume is silent, and which are unintelligible. The former the Trinitarian understands and believes; it is the latter which he cannot comprehend, and these form no article of his creed, for they are not revealed. It has been evinced under the second proposition, that the terms used by Trinitarians to convey the ideas they find in the Scriptures on this subject, are absolutely void of all contradiction. A few remarks only need be added, to show that they are intelligible. Let it be remembered, then, that belief (in its popular latitude) in a proposition, is the judgment of the mind that the particular idea predicated of the subject does belong to it. If that idea be a generic one, the belief does not regard its species, but only the generic idea which forms the predicate of the proposition. If the idea predicated be specific, the judgment of the mind of course relates to the specific idea and to no other. Thus when any person believes the proposition "God is omnipresent," he does not believe that he is omnipresent in this or that particular mode. And when the Trinitarian believes there is a distinction in the Godhead, he does not believe that it exists in this or that particular mode. Thus also in respect to the proposition "God is three in one respect, and one in another respect," which the Trinitarian believes taught in Scripture, the terms are generic and abstract, they define nothing relative to the specific nature of the things indicated by them; and our belief of these propositions can of course not be more specific, as it would be a belief of another proposition. And surely no one will deny that we have a distinct idea and a full understanding of the general abstract term *unity*, (it is superfluous to add the word *numerical*, for, strictly speaking, there can be no other unity,) and of the general terms *respect* and *reference*, and of the gen-

eral abstract term *three*. Consequently, we can fully understand these propositions; and our belief in them amounts to this, that we believe them to be justly predicated of the divine Being: and hence of course they must be intelligible.

It were an easy matter, by admitting such confusion and want of precision, as are sometimes manifested in treating of the Trinity, to involve some of those doctrines relative to God which are universally believed, in equal if not greater contradiction. To the Deist we might then propose such reasoning as this: "You admit that God is here present in this house, not a part of God, but every thing of which God consists. But if every thing of which God consists is now in this house, it cannot be out of it; for it is impossible for the whole of the same thing to be at two different places at the same time, or it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time. Therefore, if every thing of which God consists, be now in this house, it cannot be out of it, i. e. it cannot be any where else, much less every where else, at the same time." But to this we should jointly reply, that our belief does not include the specific nature and mode of the divine omnipresence; and as the objection rests on the supposition that it must be like the presence of men &c. which is gratuitous, it falls to the ground. Yet precisely of this nature are some of the reasonings with which the Orthodox are sometimes pressed, and there is not even an equal ground for it. To be placed on a perfect equality, the proposition must stand thus: "God is present in this house in one respect, and at the same instant present in every other part of the universe in another respect." In this form it would not wear so much the aspect of contradiction, as in the form in which it is believed by all, Trinitarians and others; and in this unobjectionable form, it is *exactly analogous* to the Trinitarian proposition, "God is one in one respect, and at the same time three in another respect." But even if the Trinitarian proposition were stated thus, "God is one and three in the same respect at the same time," it would not be any more objectionable than the proposition, "the same one God (not a part of him) is now here present, and at the same time, in the same sense, present in every other place in the universe." For the ideas one and three are no more subversive of one another, than the ideas of the proposition, "it is possible for the whole of the same thing to be at two or a million different and remote places at the same time." If it be replied, that spirits have no relation to space;

this is a gratuitous assumption, and it is impossible for us to conceive of a spirit except as existing in some place or other. And if this principle may be assumed, we may with equal propriety assume another, that spirits have no relation to number; although we cannot conceive of them except as one or more. And then, as God is a spirit, (the mode of his subsistence) the distinction in him has no relation to number; and if no argument can be drawn from space against his omnipresence, then also none can be derived from number against the (personal) distinction in God. For there is no more contradiction between spirit and number, than between spirit and space; and it is equally impossible, with our present constitution of mind, to think of spirits excepting as connected with space and number. From these considerations, we should learn the importance of precision, when speaking or thinking on the subject of the divine nature; we should learn humility, from the manifest imbecility of the human mind; and should be wrapped up in adoration of that God whom none by searching can find out to perfection.

PROP. 6. *Doctrines which are above reason, could never be proved contrary to reason, even on the supposition that they were so.*

It is a position which is admitted by logicians, and cannot be denied by any person habituated to close thought, that before we can establish the falsity or absurdity of a proposition, we must understand not only the terms in which it is couched, but also those internal modes and relations of the subject and predicate, on which the supposed absurdity depends. Thus, if we say, "a circle is a square," we immediately perceive the impossibility of its truth, because we are extremely familiar with those circumstances and relations (not all) of these figures on which the absurdity depends. But should we inquire of a person totally unacquainted with the principles of hydrostatics and ignorant of the fact in question, which of the two propositions is absurd, "that water will rise thirty two feet in a tube emptied of air, the one end being closed and the other open and inserted into a tub of water; or, that it will not;" he would be at a loss to know which is the true proposition, much more to prove either absurd or contrary to reason. It were easy to illustrate the truth of this proposition by copious exemplification. Let a few instances suffice. Should we say to a person unacquainted with optics, that the mind does not de-

rive its perceptions of external objects of vision immediately from the objects themselves, but from the image of them formed on the retina of the eye, by the rays of light passing from the object through the pupil, and that the image is inverted; he would be equally unable to prove it either accordant with reason or contrary to it. Or should we say to one ignorant of akoustics, that sound, for example in the explosion of a musket, is not near the musket, but in the mind of him that hears it; or that those unpleasant perceptions which are called *discords* in music, are occasioned by the irregular and confused vibrations of the air, striking the tympanum or drum of the ear; he could neither prove the assertion true nor false, much less absurd. In the same manner, were I to assert that the modus operandi of the magnetic attraction would, if known, fully explain the intrinsic nature and mode of operation of the attraction of gravitation; it would be as impossible for any man to prove the proposition false, as for me to prove it true. But, should God reveal that proposition to us, it would not appear contradictory to us, nor could we prove it so: and the reason is, because we are ignorant of the intrinsic nature and mode of operation of both, on which its contradiction would depend. From all this it is evident, that before we can prove a proposition false or absurd, we must be able to understand not only the terms of the proposition, (for these are understood in all the above examples,) but also those relations and the intrinsic nature of the subject and predicate on which the supposed absurdity would depend. And consequently, as these are wholly unknown in the Trinitarian propositions, those propositions can never be proved contrary to reason, even if they were so.

PROP. 7. *But we know, that doctrines of a divine revelation the mode and relations of which are totally incomprehensible, i. e. those commonly said to be above reason, cannot possibly be contrary to reason.*

It will be admitted, that God is not man that he should lie. Hence when a revelation has been proved to be of divine origin, we know that all the doctrines taught in it are true; and consequently, those also the mode and relations of which are totally incomprehensible.

And it will be granted, that all the comprehensible relations of revealed doctrines, are perfectly accordant with those principles and propositions which the constitution of our mental nature com-

pels us to believe, and which we call truths, i. e. accordant with our reason. Hence, as no evidence to the contrary can be produced, we are authorized to believe, that the intrinsic nature and those relations of a revealed truth, which are incomprehensible to us, that is, those which are said to be above reason, must also be accordant with the legitimate dictates of our mental constitution, i. e. with our reason.

Moreover, it will be admitted that truth must ever be consistent with itself. Hence, if some of the relations of a divine truth were contrary to our reason, all the relations of that truth must be so: and vice versa, if some of the relations of a divine truth accord with our reason, the other relations of that truth must also do so. But it must be admitted, that the comprehensible relations of those revealed truths, the mode and some of the relations of which are incomprehensible, accord perfectly with the dictates of our reason; hence it follows that the others must necessarily do so also, or they would contradict themselves.

Finally: this proposition may also be proved by a *reductio ad absurdum*. It is admitted that the dictates of reason are those propositions which the mental constitution of all men compels them to believe, that we are compelled to regard these as truths and their opposite as falsehoods. Now, if we suppose that some of the unrevealed relations of a divine truth are contrary to these propositions, it follows that we are compelled by our mental nature to believe them falsehoods; or if we suppose that those relations of the truth in question which are contrary to our reason, are true, it follows, that the others which accord with our mental structure, are false, and consequently that God so formed our mental nature that we are compelled to believe a lie; which is absurd: therefore, we know that those relations of a revealed truth which are incomprehensible to reason, cannot be contrary to reason.

END OF VOL. I.